JOURNALISM IN WARTIME

JOURNALISM IN WARTIME

EDITED BY FRANK LUTHER MOTT

DEAN, SCHOOL OF JOURNALISM
UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

American Council on Public Affairs
WASHINGTON, D. C.

M. B. SCHNAPPER, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY AND EDITOR
2153 FLORIDA AVENUE, WASHINGTON, D. C.
PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES

PREFACE

In 1908 Walter Williams founded the first School of Journalism in the world as a division of the University of Missouri. In the second year of the School's existence, shortly before the June commencement, Dean Williams organized the "Journalism Week" which has, in its annual programs, provided a national forum for leading journalists.

Early in 1943, the Faculty of the School of Journalism, after counselling with widely scattered alumni, with the editors of its home State, and with the administration of the University, decided to abandon the conventional observance of the 1943 "Journalism Week." This action was taken because of a patriotic obligation to limit all but the most essential travel, and a belief that leading American journalists would find it doubly difficult in these times to leave their great responsibilities and come to Columbia to participate in the exercises.

The Faculty was impressed, however, with the need, in these difficult and confusing weeks, for the discussion of journalistic problems by men of authority in the profession. It was therefore determined to invite such men to contribute to a symposium which should be published in book form and which should stand as the thirty-fourth annual "Journalism Week" in print. The American Council on Public Affairs, of Washington, D. C., offered to publish the volume.

We are deeply grateful to the more than thirty leaders in various journalistic fields who have taken time from their pressing and important duties to write the articles contained in this volume. That they were willing to do this solely as a service to American journalism is evidence of the high professional spirit among active newspaper men.

It is necessary to state that the opinions expressed in these articles are those of the writers and not necessarily those of the School of Journalism or of the University of Missouri. The School by this means affords a forum for important men in the profession, but takes no responsibility for any thought, opinion, or expression in any article in the symposium.

FRANK LUTHER MOTT

Dean
The School of Journalism
University of Missouri

CONTENTS

THE GENERAL PICTURE

The Newspaper Goes to War 3
John H. Sorrells

Report from the Home Front 7
Roy A. Roberts

The Role of a Free Press 12
Gardner Cowles, Jr.

CENSORSHIP

The American Way 23
Byron Price

The Use and Abuse of Restraints 34
Palmer Hoyt

The Battle for News 44
Erwin D. Canham

Dispatches Going Abroad 53
Raymond Clapper

THE BATTLE FRONTS

The European Invasion Front 59
Joe Alex Morris

The Correspondents in the Pacific 63
Barry Faris

Covering the War Against Japan 67
John R. Morris

Publishing in Shanghai 72
John B. Powell

Photographers in Uniform 77
Ralph H. Turner

Latin American Journalism 85
W. W. Copeland

Good Neighbor Promotion 90
Francis A. Jamieson

DATELINE WASHINGTON

Covering the Capital 97
Lyle C. Wilson
The White House Beat 103
Douglas B. Cornell

SPECIALIZED FIELDS

The Role of Radio 111
H. V. Kaltenborn
Public Opinion—Pro and Con 116
George Gallup
The Newspaper Woman Joins Up 126
Genevieve F. Herrick
Books as Democratic Weapons 129
Harry Hansen
Advertising in the War Effort 139
Earle Pearson

SPECIAL PROBLEMS

The Manpower Situation 151
L. M. White
The Small-town Paper 160
Edwin F. Abels
Reporting and the By-line 163
Lee A. White
Professional Education Objectives 176
Richard Powell Carter

THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

The New Respect for Newspapers 183
Basil L. Walters
The Growing Power of the Press 186
Frank E. Gannett
Ideals and Duties of Journalism 191
O. J. Ferguson
The Freedom of the Fourth Estate 194
James E. Crown

POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

The Opportunities of the Future 201
Chilton R. Bush
The Responsibilities of Advertising 205
H. A. Batten
Newspaper Statesmanship for Peace 214
Kent Cooper

THE GENERAL PICTURE

Educated in Arkansas and at Washington and Lee University, Mr. Sorrells began his newspaper career as a reporter for the Pine Bluff (Arkansas) *Daily Graphic*. Later he worked on the *Daily Oklahoman*, and then went to the Scripps-Howard papers, which employed him in managerial positions at Cleveland, Fort Worth, and Memphis. He is at present executive editor of the Scripps-Howard Newspapers and publisher of the associated Memphis papers.

THE NEWSPAPER GOES TO WAR

By JOHN H. SORRELLS

The only difference between the importance of the newspaper in peace and war is that in wartime it's more so.

There are approximately 2,500 newspapers published daily. There are approximately 9,000 of them published weekly. Scattered from one end of the country to the other, they represent various shades of political and economic faiths; they serve the divergent interests of many different communities and sections. Collectively, they express the desires, the hopes, the aims, and the dreams of one hundred and thirty million people. The newspaper is the mirror of the American way of life. It is the voice of the American people.

The American way of doing things is through the process of free discussion. The upshot of every step toward action—whether by Congress, a Chamber of Commerce, or the directors of a business firm —is to "appoint a committee." That's the way we do things—by discussing, arguing, and finally reaching a collective decision. Political policies are not created; they are hammered out on the anvil of debate. The newspaper is the sledge.

The American newspaper is more than an institution of democracy. It is an instrument of democracy. It probes ceaselessly and relentlessly into all of the crevices of our social and economic and political life. It penetrates the remotest recesses. Its technique may sometimes be merciless, and on occasion it may strike an innocently exposed nerve, but it leaves no hidden source of infection.

In peace times, the newspaper has a simple, over-all responsibility

to the American public—to safeguard and preserve those institutions and that form of government and that way of life which the American people have chosen for themselves. This is a responsibility which, in peace time, need not be shared with any other major interest or objective.

In war time, those responsibilities are compounded. Their execution becomes complex. A new element is injected—the winning of the war. All the energies of the nation are and must be concentrated on this sole determination. No other single non-military institution in our democracy is more effective in this connection than the press—although, in taking on its share of responsibility for prosecuting the war, it must function negatively as well as positively.

A nation at war must gear itself to act swiftly. Men must be invested with vast powers to decide things promptly and at times arbitrarily. When a democracy is at war, some of the peace-time rights and privileges of individuals must be sacrificed to the common aim of delivering telling military blows at the enemy. Many elements go into the organization and deliverance of such blows. The attack is delivered not only through logistics and men; the elements of secrecy and deception are also employed. Strategic and tactical plans must be developed and matured without accurate knowledge by the enemy.

Information is an indispensable weapon of war as well as of peace. The enemy would, of course, like to know how much material we are producing, where, and at what rates of production. He would like to know where we are assembling that material, when it is being moved and by what route. And he is exceedingly anxious to know how many men have been given what degree of training and what military units have been moved where.

In peace time, the sole responsibility of the newspaper is to inform, to enlighten, to illuminate. In war time, a great part of the responsibility is not to inform, but to suppress, to guard, to screen information of the most interesting sort. This is the paradox confronting us at the present time.

In a people's war, the people fight best—they give of their earnings and time and energy most willingly—when they are kept informed about the results of their efforts and the progress of their cause. This is not merely to satisfy the natural and traditional curiosity of the American people. It is a vital factor in creating and preserving public morale.

A people who have been as fully and as honestly informed over the years as the American people become uneasy and suspicious in any situation in which they feel they are not getting the facts. The best

efforts of the American people in any critical period have always been delivered in some ratio as to their understanding of the nature and gravity of the crisis. The American people always want to know what the score is—and they pitch well when they're behind.

The American press has taken its responsibility for screening important military information seriously. Yet the ever-gnawing question among editors in war times is how far they should go in the discharge of their responsibilities for informing, and for not informing. They know that there is no greater force in America than public opinion, and they know that intelligent public opinion cannot be formed without information. Should they lean too far in the direction of suppression, it will be impossible to bring public opinion adequately to bear on some features of the conduct of the war.

A delicate balance is required. The preservation of this balance commands the utmost in sincere fidelity to two great causes: the cause of a free press, and the cause of a nation at war. It requires intelligence, patience and wisdom.

There are other responsibilities, less fundamental in character and, happily, less difficult to discharge. That is the responsibility for using the instrument of publicity in the promotion of the various efforts connected with the major task of winning victories. Not only must the public be informed about the necessity of buying bonds, or saving scrap, fats and oil, or planting victory gardens, but it must be stimulated and inspired to intensify its efforts along these lines.

Again we have evidence of the tremendous power of American public opinion when the American public is given the facts, and when its interest and determination are focused on desired objectives. Government at best is unwieldy and inarticulate. It maintains its chief contacts with the public through the medium of the newspaper, and it is enabled to act more promptly and more effectively because its wants and needs are made known to the public through the press. The American housewife, with clippings pasted on her pantry door, has had little difficulty in grasping the essential facts about rationing, for instance, because she has been so thoroughly and intelligently informed about it through the press.

Not only do the responsibilities of the newspaper in war times intensify and increase, but the problems of newspaper publishing likewise grow and intensify. A great many of these problems—most of them, in fact—are problems common to all industries where the factor of man-power and materials is involved. For example, the newspaper is a manufacturing industry in which a very large proportion of its personnel are specialists. These people are proficient because of

years of experience and training. It is not easy to replace them. Yet newspaper personnel, like the personnel of all other industries, has been depleted through the draft of its man-power for military or other war service.

The American newspaper is performing its war-time duties brilliantly and faithfully. Despite the self-imposed restrictions of censorship, the American public is still the best informed public in the world. In no essential has the American newspaper failed to keep faith with the necessities of military secrecy—and there is evidence, which will mount as time goes on, of its vigilance and effectiveness in preserving the essential elements of a free press.

America is non-militaristic. We are amateurs at war. There is now, and there always has been, bungling, stumbling, fumbling in the prosecution of war. Some order eventually is brought out of the bureaucratic chaos of a nation of amateur war-makers. That order is hastened because of the ceaseless proddings of the newspapers.

In the period we have been at war, the power of public opinion has been directed to certain broad subjects, with the result that recognition of certain needs has been forced, and corrections of some major faults have been made. The constant pressure of public opinion, through the medium of the newspaper, has forced a universal recognition of the importance of air power. The victories of American air power to date have been achieved not altogether and alone by the men who fight the planes or the generals who direct them, but to some extent because the American public has, with intuitive wisdom, insisted that our leaders give us superiority in this vital arm.

This power of public opinion, directed by the searching inquiry of newspapers into other phases of the war's administration, has moved government to action in straightening out the rubber situation, in rationalizing the food problem, in bringing some order and sense into the man-power problem. None of these things has been solved adequately as yet, but their solution is further along the road. When these problems are finally solved, the job will have been done in great part because of the pressure of public opinion, directed by the press.

The American people are eager to confuse and confound the enemy. But they also want to know how we are doing. The editor's job, in war time, is to let our people know the score at all times—and at the same time withhold from the enemy information as to whether the next pitch will be a fast ball or a curve. The American public can accept with complete confidence the intention and the ability of the American newspaper to perform both of its major tasks with fidelity and distinction.

Mr. Roberts was born and educated in Kansas. He has been with the *Kansas City Star* since 1909, including a long term as its Washington correspondent. He has been a specialist in the fields of politics and economics. He is now managing editor of the *Kansas City Star* and president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors. He was a Captain in World War I.

REPORT FROM THE HOME FRONT

By ROY A. ROBERTS

This is a report—a factual report as far as it is possible to make it—on what the American newspapers have been doing to coöperate in the war effort. It is a report any newspaper man is glad to make because, as the struggle becomes grimmer, the pinch tighter, you can sense that there has been a growing appreciation of the fact that the newspapers, by and large, have met their responsibilities in this hour of national peril.

It may be news to a lot of people, but the newspapers are still operating on a voluntary code of censorship, self-imposed, and this censorship is working to a degree that has amazed the Army and Navy. Don't take my word for it; just ask the Army and Navy brass-hats who are in a position to know. As newspapers, we were fortunate in the selection of the censor—Byron Price—who, until he was called to Washington because of the war, was the directing news head of the great Associated Press. Price surrounded himself with capable newspaper and radio assistants. There were some mistakes and stupidities at first and there will be more before the war is over, but the finest tribute that has been paid newspapers will come from Mr. Price himself on the almost one-hundred-percent effort to observe not just the letter but the complete spirit of the censorship code. I am glad that a committee of the American Society of Newspaper Editors had a part in drafting the code and in revising it from time to time, and will continue so to act until victory comes.

When you hear whispers of this or that piece of startling informa-

tion being withheld, you naturally think, "Well, the censors certainly are at work." In actuality, the Office of Censorship has nothing to do with giving out the news once the news develops. Experience has shown that Mr. Price's agency has time and again been a factor in getting stories released that otherwise mistakenly would have been kept out of the papers.

It may appear strange for any newspaper man to have a kind word for any censorship, his natural enemy. But it is only mere justice to say that Mr. Price has handled his unpleasant war job with understanding and intelligence.

As things are run now, the Army still controls its information. The Navy handles all its releases. The Office of War Information, headed by Elmer Davis, puts out all other war information. Of necessity, military people are not trained primarily in public relations. Nor do they often have the appreciation that in a total war the American people must be kept informed, fully and accurately, as to the progress of that war. Especially is this true of the high military and naval officials who think chiefly in terms of strategy and fighting. There were a lot of stupidities in handling of military news at first. Some still exist. Probably more irritations have been caused in the average newspaper office by the ridiculous hush-hush put around the locations of camps and big munitions factories in the early phases of the war than by anything else. Instance after instance could be cited wherein tens of thousands of men had worked on a project and everyone in the community knew about it, and yet the newspapers were forbidden even to hint that anything was happening until, weeks later, some Senator or Congressman revealed all—or nearly all—in a speech. The delay served no useful purpose whatever. It kept nothing from the enemy. But it did cause people to unnecessarily lose faith in their local newspapers for "not telling the truth about the war." Once the people lose faith in government statements in their newspapers, then God help the home front. Instances such as those cited occurred by the thousand. They grew out of excessive fear of telling something, of misuse of newly-acquired authority.

As the war progresses, these absurdities are ironing out. The Navy at first withheld information on certain sea-actions until the nation seethed with unfounded misinformation. No one was to blame except Washington. The Navy has been through a process of education. It has greatly speeded up the lag in time in getting out information and increased the completeness of it. The Army in North Africa, from the outset, has been frank. So, on the whole, while there have been irritations and some downright and extremely harmful mistakes, yet the

relationship between the newspapers and the war effort has improved rather than deteriorated.

On the non-military side there was entirely too much lack of genuine information on the status of production throughout the first year of war, and it hurt morale as nothing else did. If the people were not aroused to total war, blame Washington, not the people. When the production schedules were chaotic, certain bureaucrats perhaps were not unwilling to censor information as much to save themselves from criticism as from any possible fear such information might be of aid and comfort to the enemy. But as we as a nation moved relentlessly into total war, even the production story began to be told.

The big point not to forget in all this is that newspapers have kept the faith, have bent over backwards to print nothing that might be of any value to the enemy, even though they had misgivings as to whether they were pursuing the really patriotic course. Looking back as a newspaper man over these months, I find that if I have any criticism of the newspapers, it is that during the wasted months and months on rubber, on food, on production, while Washington was full of petty feuds and guerrilla warfare of its own, the newspapers did not speak out more loudly and more vehemently than they did. But if they failed their readers, it was due to an excess of patriotism, not a denial of responsibility. The historian, years hence, looking back over our press during war times, will, I am sure, reach the conclusion that the newspaper contribution to the war effort on the whole was profoundly constructive; that there was mighty little of making a story just to make a sensation; that the newspapers took their responsibilities so seriously that if they erred at all, it was on the side of not raising as much hell as they should have raised. A comparison of the press during this war with what Lincoln faced in the sixties would be startling.

Some months ago the American Society of Newspaper Editors, at a conference in Washington, sought to bring about a better understanding between the newspapers and the war effort. In the past, our Society had held its meeting, generally in Washington, but timed in conjunction with newspaper week in New York. At our directors' meeting in October, we named a committee to meet any special problems that might arise involving the war effort on the part of the government and the newspapers. We told all the important officials in the government, "If there is any way we can help the war effort, let us know." Elmer Davis, head of the OWI, took advantage of the situation at once. Our executive committee was called to Washington and there held a two-day conference, in the course of which the official of every important war agency, from the President down, had oppor-

tunity to meet with the editors and give them the background and inside of situations.

This Washington conference took the place of our annual convention. But so fruitful was it in results on both sides, it may be repeated again next Fall. Before the conference, there was a question of how many editors could come to such a meeting when all of them were pressed day and night with urgent problems at home. Our guesses ranged from seventy-five to one hundred. Actually, two hundred turned up. We were talked to and we talked back for forty-eight hours, until every one was dizzy, and then had to have an extra Sunday morning meeting to get our own Society business out of the way. It struck me that the thought uppermost in everyone's mind, as I talked to dozens and dozens of editors and managing editors, was this: "Are we living up to our war responsibilities? Are all of us doing all we can? What mistakes are we making? What should we be doing that will contribute more to the war effort?" With such a spirit, of course any self-imposed censorship will work. The only real danger from any such censorship is that the newspapers will lean over too far backward.

We have opened our columns to war drives of every sort. We have virtually turned our newspapers over to food drives, to rationing explanations, to rubber conservation programs, to victory garden material. We have launched campaigns for WACs, for WAVEs, for SPARs. Quite recently, the Treasury urged the formation of an Allied Newspaper Council of publishers and editors, large and small, to take the first responsibility for putting over a new bond drive and to spread the story of why there must be widespread distribution of bonds as a check on inflation. The scrap metal drive was put over by the newspapers after every other agency had failed.

As far as the newspapers are concerned, this has been and will be a total war. We have a still bigger job to do, for the end is not yet. We are going to have to do it under greater difficulties—short of newsprint, short of man-power, short of zinc, short of pretty nearly everything except the desire to do the job in the most intelligent and effective way possible.

Keeping the home front unbroken, as I see it, is the newspapers' first function in war.

I close with a salute to the greatest war journalism job of all. The story of this war is being written as that of no other war has been in the past. Our correspondents are at the front lines everywhere—in the Far East jungles, the desert sands of Africa, the bleak, icy shores of the Arctic, aboard the fighting ships on the far seas, flying the

planes as they bomb Berlin, as they pound the Japs in the far Pacific. More stories, greater stories—no superlative could exaggerate the job that the front-line warriors of the press are doing. The individual heroes are legion. Many have died in the line of service. Many more have been wounded or disabled for life. Many more will make the final sacrifice before this ghastly war is over—in order that the American people at home may have the news. It has been the greatest job of reporting the world has ever known.

To our comrades on the battle fronts those of us on the home front make a pledge. We will back you up to the limit. We will keep the home front unbroken. When the war is over, we will sweep aside all vestiges of censorship and control, self-imposed and government imposed. We will make certain that a free press may live to do its part to make a better free world.

Son of the owner of the *Des Moines Register* and *Tribune*, Mr. Cowles was educated at Harvard and later filled various editorial chairs of the *Register* and *Tribune*. Aggressive and imaginative, he became president of the Iowa Broadcasting Company, the Register and Tribune Company, and later of *Look* magazine. He is also vice-president of the *Minenapolis Star-Journal*. At the time he wrote his article, he was serving as Domestic Director of the Office of War Information. Robert J. Blakely, also of the OWI, collaborated with him in the preparation of the article.

THE ROLE OF A FREE PRESS

By GARDNER COWLES, JR

In order to discuss the rôle of the free press at this juncture in our history, we must know the character of the problems a free society must face in a war with a slave society. Our chief problem is how to produce and use as much as possible of the right things in the right places at the right times and to continue to do so until the enemy has been completely destroyed as a military force.

It has been a common conception that free people would exert themselves more than slaves, but we were not so sure that we could economize and organize as well as the slaves of totalitarian governments. We are now making the new and thrilling discovery that democracy can take it, can dish it out, can produce the goods, and can come through.

The real test is still before us, but we are now confident that we shall win. Free people will exert themselves more grimly, economize more austerely, and organize more effectively than a nation of slaves. The more they do, the more they'll want to do. The harder the job, the tougher they'll be—*but only if they understand why*. Let's break this down a bit.

A deluded and tyrannized people will do much; but at the height of the strain they will crack, because they will realize that they have been falsely informed and they will not have the urge to tap that last reservoir of endurance. But a people who understand why they fight and why they must win and how they can win will go to depths which even they did not know they possessed. This is a belief based on the

evidence of public opinion polls and personal experience. The Americans who best understand the war are taking the most active part in it and are eager to do more.

Against this background, the democratic press appears in its true stature. The newspaper, as we know it in the United States, is a product of the democratic movement. Its rôle, simply and grandly, is to help equip the people with the information and understanding of their affairs which they need to govern themselves. In order to rule themselves, the people of a democracy must have better judgment than those who would rule them, and therefore they must have adequate information and understanding.

To meet its grave responsibility in war, the press must analyze itself sincerely and seek intelligently and tirelessly to do more and better.

In this connection, we should consider our profession's basic reason for being. Reflecting on our task, we shall find, not the cheap, cynical glamor which popularly surrounds a newspaper, but the dignity of high purpose. We must subordinate all ancillary and coincidental interests to that main one.

During war we have occasion to re-examine the problem of objectivity. We find that though we operate according to a point of view and exercise moral judgment, we try not to be subjective or biased; we try to allow the freest possible scope and exchange of information, comment, opinion and understanding. *But we aren't neutral.* We use facts, we employ the "strategy of truth," for a purpose—to help win the war. This purpose requires a re-ordering of our entire life. The problem isn't very different in war from what it is in peace. Every time we use one fact and not another, or give this greater emphasis than that, or put this fact first and that one second, we are exercising judgment, intellectual and moral. In trying to escape it, we judge unconsciously or become pointless. We should accept this responsibility frankly and humbly. We should try to be as aware as possible of the bases of our judgments and to make those bases broad, sound, and truly moral.

We should analyze ourselves as a *focus* of institutions in a democracy. No other group is more intimately involved in the delicate resolutions which secure the national freedom.

"Newspapering is a business." But so are doctoring and teaching and preaching. Are they nothing more? The relationship between free enterprise and the free press is vital because in our system the relationship between free enterprise and political democracy is vital. Further, an essential function of free enterprise is advertising; adver-

tising supports our free media of information and opinion; these free media help support democracy. To have integrity, an institution must be able to resist the forces which would corrupt it. What we need is a balancing of and cooperation between kinds of power. Free enterprise in a democracy meets that need for us. Conceivably some other system, or our own at another time, might achieve political and social democracy without free enterprise. If so, it will have to work out its equipoise as painfully and tediously as we have worked out ours. I do not see that system yet.

The newspaper is also a focus of town and gown. We serve our scholars, analysts, and scientists; we try to report their contributions to the people. We are a focus of groups, classes, and sections. We speak of the world to a section; we speak for that section to the world. At our best we are a common body of knowledge for individuals, groups, and classes upon which to build agreement. We are a court, a forum, a people's university. We are the nerve-center of society.

In total war we see the meaning of our position. Each of the many ways in which our people are organized is a specialized arm trying with all its strength and skill to insure victory. A steel company is more than a business. A political party is more than a faction. A college is more than a school. Each in its way is a corps and a factory. Our job is to help train and coordinate them. This is true, though not so obvious, in peace, too.

One of the most important rôles of the press is as a focus between the people and their government.

In the blundering years which lie behind, too many of us defined democracy in some such way as this: "A system which requires nothing difficult of its citizens" or "A system in which the government has only police powers." In total war we see that a democratic government is the instrument of the people to organize and direct their effort. If this is to be realized, we must erase the false distinction between government and people. Measures necessary to win the war are adopted by the people through their government; the government's decisions are not imposed upon the people. A sound attitude on this matter cannot be achieved through ballyhoo; it must rest upon fact. But it can be destroyed by careless or awkward handling of information. Thus the responsibility rests particularly on the government's information services and on the media.

Why do we have an Office of War Information? So many activities necessarily are centered in the government in total war that efforts must be made to facilitate the handling of information concerning those activities. The mass of information is smothering; yet impor-

tant areas might be left blank. Contradictions and arguments which in peace can be battled out in public to general advantage serve in war only to confuse and annoy. Disproportionate emphasis or relationships which are unclear falsify and distract. Therefore, the OWI, whose order it is to "formulate and carry out, through the use of press, radio, motion picture, and other facilities, information programs designed to facilitate the development of an informed and intelligent understanding, at home and abroad, of the status and progress of the war effort and of the war policies, activities, and aims of the government."

The method of the OWI is to use the established media. From them, and particularly from the press, we have received heartening support. But the problem is changing and growing. Only the press itself can discover and employ the ways best to coöperate as a channel of information to the people from their government.

I should like to project the problem beyond the war. That the government should be used affirmatively by the people to direct our affairs for the rest of our lives, there can be little argument. We must use government as our guide if we would not have it our master. In this situation, what is to be the relationship of the press to government? That it must be free of the government and that it must coöperate with the government are two obvious imperatives.

So far I have been urging upon my profession that self-analysis which is the source of democracy's genius, flexibility, and strength. Now I should like to give a few concrete suggestions to stimulate search for ways in which the press can do better and more. Let us use the traditional categories of reporting (or news) and interpretation (or editorial) and add to these, for reasons to be explained, advertising.

Reporting the facts remains in war the most important function of a newspaper, but made vastly more complicated and demanding.

Only one of the complications, by no means major, is the need for security of information which would aid the enemy. I am happy to say that this problem is being satisfactorily handled by the government and the press. The violations of the voluntary code have been negligible; the few applications of censorship by the government which have excited widespread criticism in one part of the press also won stout defense from another part and provoked sharp argument within the councils of government. The task of continuing to observe and to educate our people on the subtleties of military security, of course, is still with us.

The greatest single source of news in total war is the government. It is the government's duty to deserve trust as a reliable source of

information. Where that trust is deserved, it is the newspaper's duty to serve to the utmost as a channel.

Only the members of the press themselves, by their imagination and skill, can discover and choose the best ways of handling official information. Many times government information issued nationally requires adaptation to local readership; perhaps it can be made more interesting or sharper or more cogent. In the OWI we try to give timeliness and proportion to informational programs in view of the total picture. It is helpful if you follow these where they are applicable and adapt them where appropriate to a particular region.

Beyond its duties as a channel of official information, the responsibility of the press stretches far. Perhaps only a bureaucrat can really appreciate how valuable are the analytical and supplementary stories written independently by the press on world and national problems.

I wish to pay a compliment particularly to the reporting of the war and of conditions abroad by the correspondents of the press services and of the larger newspapers. These correspondents have proved themselves the most accurate prophets of the war. They are living up to that high standard now. In the world after the war, I am convinced that we can achieve the four freedoms only if we have a fifth freedom, hitherto enjoyed almost alone by the English-speaking peoples—the freedom of information, "everywhere in the world."

And both as a director of OWI and as a private citizen, may I express my conviction on another point? Intelligent, informed, and honest criticism of government programs and policies is an indispensable part of the service of a free press to a free people in war.

The passage of information in a democratic society cannot be merely one way—from the government to the people; it must be the other way also, and it must crisscross the country, weaving sections and groups and specialties together in a pattern of detailed and overall understanding.

In the United States, there is no such thing as a national newspaper. The nation is far too large and complicated; modern society is far too various. There are enough groups and localities and subject areas within our country to provide inexhaustible material for all the newspapers and all the resources which we have. But partly because of the way America has developed, we tend to be provincial. Our attention and interest are chiefly focused on a relatively small part of the country, on a relatively small group of people, and on a relatively small part of the wonderfully complex American life. I sometimes feel that the news services of the United States are like sensitive micro-

phones. The slightest, most trivial whisper near those microphones is amplified throughout the world. A deafening explosion farther away is broadcast merely as a pop. The real story of endeavor and accomplishment in this war is not being written in Washington or on Broadway; it is being written in the factories and on the farms and in the homes. The most important subject matter is not parlor politics or high finance; it is human and technical and, by our usual treatment, unexciting.

The motto of a small newspaper in Iowa, the *Whiting Argus,* is "The only newspaper in the world interested in Whiting, Iowa." This is a good motto. An adaptation of it could be the motto of any newspaper. If it looks around, it can find important events, interests and subjects which will be unreported and unexplained, if not explained by it. Out of our gruelling experience of interdependence in this war should come a more cosmopolitan awareness by Americans of all America—a deep fellowship.

This means that we must learn how to make events and subjects previously considered rather dull seem as dynamic as they really are. Who of us thought a few years ago that toothpaste tubes or kitchen fats or workers in copper mines or high school girls scooping corn to hogs would be as vital to the nation as they are today? The "little people" have always been the real heroes; "prosaic" activities have always been the real fabric of history. They always will be.

Just because there is so much news and so many matters of importance, the need for background is all the greater. When people are suddenly introduced to a new facet of life, a new part of the country, or a new problem of their existence of which they had not been previously aware, they cannot understand its significance unless they are given help. One of the rôles of the press is to provide background on a myriad of subjects, to the limit of its knowledge and skill and space.

This very variety and richness of subjects requires something else—integration. One of the things which we sorely need is help in understanding the relationships between the parts of our complicated world and of our prodigious tasks. How does this drab little thing fit into the dramatic event? How does one part of the war effort affect another apparently unrelated? Newspapers must do service here. They must show how things fit; they must try to bridge the gaps; they must pay attention to movement and to entirety. What do a long series of stories add up to? What are the deep issues beneath and above the compelling and absorbing flux of a moment?

And, finally, never before has there been such an opportunity or need for special feature articles. The food columns of our newspapers

are being used today with an imagination never known before. Columns on gardening, on clothes, on the home, on farming, on mining—one cannot exhaust the list—are needed. Each newspaper can discover for itself unique ways of service.

The opportunities and responsibilities of the editorial page are equally expanded in war. We must try to help our readers see as far into the future and look as deeply into the seeds of current affairs as possible. The editorial page is particularly suited for dealing with relationships between aspects and for grappling with the sum of parts. Here we can try to help our readers understand the movement and drama of events. We can introduce background and recall important basic facts long forgotten. I urge the editorial writers to pay attention to the problems of meaning. The more facts we have to handle, the greater is our need for a frame of reference and a system of values in which to integrate them. Also I recommend to the editorial pages more attention to the social rôle of science, which is playing so vital a part in the war and which will change our lives in unimaginable ways.

All this challenges the editorial page to be, not heavy and undigestible, but skillful and lively. The newspaper, and particularly the editorial page, should, in the best sense of the word, be the great popularizer of complex subjects.

I think it more important than ever before that the editorial page be the people's forum, that it provide a safety valve for its readers and offer a platform for the important messages which, so frequently, obscure people have no other means of telling.

All this adds up to the necessity of the editorial page to be more modest and moderate. When our profession was young, when we had a greater margin of error, when newspapers were small and many, when we were working out the ethics and principles of our profession, we could afford to be intemperate. That time has passed.

Advertising has an important part to play in informing the people of war programs. Advertising men are the experts in public attitudes. They know how to measure and change them. They know how to plan and how to put a proposition up to the public. They know how to persuade the public to act in accordance with determined plans.

There is much that advertising cannot do. It cannot sell a belief in the value of the war, or faith in democracy, or confidence in the future. However, there is much that advertising can do. Too often the people are unconvinced as to why government programs are necessary—or confused as to their details—and advertising is the only force which can put these government programs before the public in simple,

exact terms *often enough* and with *enough power* and with *enough control* to get results.

Some have suggested plans which call for a high degree of compulsion and regimentation of media and advertising. It is important to remind ourselves again of one of the fundamental functions of advertising—its support of the free information media which make democracy possible. I do not want to see that important relationship of private business to media altered even in war. That is why I am skeptical of the wisdom of a giant federal government advertising fund to be used to help explain the problems of the home front.

But I do think that advertising has not really mobilized in behalf of the war effort the way the press and the radio industry have done. The fault is largely ours in OWI. I want to see that job undertaken voluntarily by hundreds of individual advertisers under the leadership of the War Advertising Council working with OWI.

During this war the American press is coming of age. I don't need to discuss the difficulties—increased costs and shortages of paper, manpower, rubber, gasoline, equipment, and many other things. Of course, we are working under difficulties; all our people are. But despite this we must do a better job.

In this war the American press is emerging passionate in its devotion to freedom and sober in its acceptance of responsibility. Vast freedoms and grave responsibilities are ahead. The modern world in which we are moving at a dizzy rate has more fundamental unities and more basic differences than any other society contrived by man. If either the unities or the differences are neglected, we shall suffer a common ruin. The free, responsible newspaper has a high duty and a rare opportunity to strengthen the unities which bind us together and to explain the differences which set us against each other.

As the militarists have demonstrated, it is easy to release war on the modern world; but once released, total war unleashes tidal forces which sweep us uncontrollably in directions unpredictable. We cannot stem or dam them. To a degree we can direct them. To a larger degree we can understand them, preparing for the day when we may have a greater degree of control. To do even this much, all our people must have as thorough information and as deep understanding as possible, and throughout our society we must have intellectual and moral leadership of the highest order.

It is the high rôle of the press to foster this. If it does—and I believe it can—it will be rewarded by confidence and the privilege of playing even a more important part in the "century of the common man."

CENSORSHIP

The Director of the Office of Censorship is a Hoosier by birth and a graduate of Wabash College. He began his newspaper career in Indiana in 1909. Three years later he entered the service of the Associated Press, with which he continued until Prsident Roosevelt called him to his present task shortly after the attack on Pearl Harbor. He had been chief of the AP Washington bureau for ten years, and executive news editor in charge of the entire general news report of the AP for four years. He was a Captain during World War I.

THE AMERICAN WAY

By BYRON PRICE

What to do about the press in wartime has puzzled governments and peoples ever since the invention of movable type. It may well be that the patience and loyal coöperation of American publications in the present war will provide an answer for posterity.

The need for some degree of journalistic restraint when the guns speak is no longer denied by anyone. Both experience and common sense testify convincingly to the dangers which might result to a nation struggling for its life if the public prints were left untrammeled and unguided by considerations of security. General Sherman may have been guilty of characteristic overemphasis when he referred to war correspondents as "spies" because they were giving information to the enemy; yet his observation was not without its modicum of truth. Of sounder mold is the classic dictum of Justice Holmes: "When a nation is at war many things that might be said in time of peace are such a hindrance to its effort that their utterance will not be endured as long as men fight."

This conclusion, it should be observed, embodies no reflection upon the patriotism or good intentions of the press. Editors are only human. In a free, peace-loving country few of them are likely to have given intensive study to what may or may not help the enemy; and an inadvertent disclosure is exactly as damaging as a malicious disclosure.

Furthermore, it is a thoroughly specious argument to say that newspapers can safely print whatever they desire if there is strict censorship at the border. No censorship can or should seal the national

boundaries hermetically. For one thing, it has become a routine duty of foreign embassies and legations to advise their governments at once of important news events of which they learn, sending their messages in diplomatic code which is protected under international law. Consider also the question of international travelers. Such travelers must go back and forth if the business of the country and indeed the prosecution of the war itself are to proceed; and no search which censorship could make would discover what secrets they might be carrying in the hidden recesses of their minds.

The best way to protect military information is to keep it out of circulation at home, and in this field the responsibility of the newspaper is very great. The need for restraint, either self-imposed or otherwise, cannot be questioned. The only debatable element is how the restraint should be applied.

Leaving aside numerous local and half-hearted experiments, society has hit upon but three basic methods of controlling publication. One is the method of rigid government compulsion, with a censor always at the editor's elbow. One is a compromise procedure, under which enforcement is largely voluntary, but with a strictly worded statute hovering in the background. The third is a system of self-discipline under the leadership of the government, but with no statutory sanction and no penalties.

The completely compulsory method needs no discussion. It is the familiar type of the totalitarian countries where the newspapers are told every day what to do and what not to do. This type of censorship has never flourished in the United States. It was employed in some instances in the earlier years of the Republic, particularly in zones controlled by the military; but newspapers in those times were small in number and influence, and of so limited a circulation that no one really bothered greatly about them.

The compromise method is the one now used by the British. Editors are not required to submit beforehand what they intend to publish. But no editor ever forgets that if he runs afoul of security, he can be hauled before a magistrate to answer that section of the Defense Regulations which makes it a punishable crime to publish "any . . . matter whatsoever, information as to which would or might be directly or indirectly useful to the enemy." This is strong language, conceivably covering not only disclosures of information but also editorial expressions which might hamper the conduct of the war. British censorship calls the operation "voluntary," defending the definition on the ground that there is no authority to interfere prior to publication, but only to punish after the publication has taken place. Incidentally, the

same provision, in precisely the same words, is on the statute books of Canada.

The truly voluntary system may be considered almost an exclusively American institution. It is an example, on a grand scale, of democracy at work. It furnishes a test of an extreme kind of the ability of free institutions to impose self-discipline upon themselves and to marshal their resources, without mandatory order or threat, on the side of national security.

There is no concealing the fact that such a procedure has its hazards and its complications. There is no use denying that when the present voluntary censorship was undertaken immediately after Pearl Harbor, many public officials and many publishers expected it to fail. Some still expect failure. Only the end of the war can demonstrate whether that expectation is correct. The most that can be said as this is written is that so far the experiment has not failed. On the contrary, the attitude of the publishing industry has made it possible to date to bring voluntary censorship to the highest level of success ever attained in this or any other country.

The doubters have good historical ground for their apprehensions. Eighty years before the Japanese descended on Hawaii, a brief experiment in voluntary censorship ended in fiasco. The story of that venture was told vividly by Mr. Quintus C. Wilson in the *Journalism Quarterly* for September, 1942. The article deserves careful reading in these times.

The impetus of the 1861 censorship came from the Army of the Potomac. General McClellan brought together the representatives of a comparatively small but powerful group of newspapers and press services. All of them, including McClellan himself, signed their names to the following:

"At a meeting of the representatives of the newspaper press at Washington, August 2, 1861, after consultation with Major General McClellan, it was unanimously

"Resolved, To accede to the following suggestions from him, and to transmit them to the editors of all newspapers in the loyal states and District of Columbia:

"First. That all such editors be requested to refrain from publishing either as editorial, or as correspondence of any description, or from any point, any matter that may furnish aid and comfort to the enemy.

"Second. That they also be requested and earnestly solicited to signify to their correspondents here and elsewhere their approval of the foregoing suggestion, and to comply with it in spirit and letter.

"Also resolved, That the Government be respectfully requested to

afford to the representatives of the press facilities for obtaining and immediately transmitting all information suitable for publication, particularly touching engagement with the enemy."

In spite of these high intentions, much military information continued to appear in print. The reason is not entirely clear, but doubtless the results stemmed from numerous causes. Only a part of the press of the country was represented, and competition in those days was even keener than today. It was not easy to keep contact and sustain a voluntary effort among publications widely scattered, with poor communications, and no trade association to bind them together. Besides, the plan omitted all provision for supervision and set up no authority to rule on disputed points.

After a short time the experiment collapsed and the government took such steps as it could through seizure of the telegraph lines and by other means to withhold information on a compulsory basis. A number of newspapers also were suppressed by the military, and others were forced to suspend through cancellation of their postal privileges.

During the Spanish-American war, a spotty and largely unsuccessful attempt at compulsory censorship was made by the government under its general war powers. The military authorities set up machinery to control press dispatches from Cuba and Puerto Rico to Florida, but circumvention of the arrangement was frequent. A censor also was established in New York City, but he had little success. No one seems to have made any attempt to bring the press of the country, as a whole, into voluntary coöperation. The situation was so generally chaotic that Frank Luther Mott, in his valuable work *American Journalism,* describes it as "extraordinary." He adds: "Newspapers freely printed reports of the movements of the Navy and Army and such news and rumors of American plans as they could gather."

But the idea of voluntary censorship was revived in diffident fashion during the border mobilization of 1914. In a preliminary chapter of his interesting and valuable book *Censorship 1917,* Dr. James R. Mock relates how the War Department asked that newspapers refrain from publishing information damaging to national defense, and how the celebrated James Keeley, then editor of the *Chicago Herald,* was unable to get a satisfactory answer when he asked the Department for specifications. Says Dr. Mock: "The Judge Advocate General could offer no suggestions. He observed that under the circumstances patriotism of newspaper editors and their coöperation . . . had to be relied upon with respect to such matters as Keeley had pointed out."

This left the press just where it was before, and the result was renewed controversy and uncertainty. The newspapers seem to have

been quite willing to go along, had Washington provided the necessary leadership. By its failure to do so, the government may be justly regarded as largely responsible for the failure.

The recollection of what had happened in 1914 was still rankling in the minds of both the government and the press when involvement in the first World War began to appear inevitable at the beginning of 1917. On the one side, the War and Navy Departments and some members of Congress had come to the definite conclusion that war would require compulsory censorship. On the other side, the newspapers were making ready to resist any step in that direction, which they regarded as an infringement of the First Amendment.

Even as early as August, 1916, the War Department was urging Congressional leaders to act. On the following February 5, Chairman Webb of the House Judiciary Committee presented a bill authorizing life imprisonment for the publication of information "likely or intended to cause disaffection in, or to interfere with the success of, the Military or Naval Forces of the United States." Various alternative proposals were presented during the Congressional debate which followed. One of them would have authorized the Secretaries of War and Navy to suspend for thirty days any publication which disclosed military information. All of these measures failed of passage, although Congress did provide in the Espionage Act certain punishments in cases where actual malicious intent could be shown.

Meantime, President Wilson had created the Committee on Public Information, designed not only to handle propaganda, but apparently destined also to administer whatever press censorship law might be enacted. Already the newspapers were complying to a degree with various scattered requests which had come from the War and Navy Departments. When no legislation was forthcoming, the Committee on Public Information issued on July 30, 1917, a summary of outstanding requests and some which were entirely new. Thus was launched the first really comprehensive effort to bring the entire press of the country into voluntary coöperation according to a detailed and integrated plan.

The new list covered twenty-one subjects, including principally movements of ships and troops. No one was ordered to do anything or refrain from doing anything; the Committee simply "requested," and added: "These requests go to the press without larger authority than the necessities of the war-making branches. Their enforcement is a matter for the press itself."

The beginning was not altogether fortuitous. Many of the wounds

of the legislative battle over censorship were still causing pain to both sides. The administration had set up the Committee on Public Information as a civilian organization, but the preamble of the Committee's bill of particulars revived the spectre of military control by stating directly that the requests "go to the press of the United States directly from the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy." Besides, the Committee's statement took occasion to charge that there had been "repeated and serious violations" of previous government requests, without naming the culprits—an echo of a dispute which had been in progress for some weeks.

A previous Committee statement had said that messages received from abroad could be published freely, but when news of the arrival of some American transports in Europe was thus published, the Committee objected. The new set of requests reversed the previous ruling. It was asked specifically that no news of the arrival of American vessels abroad should be published except upon announcement by the War or Navy Departments.

Therein lay one of the continued causes for dissension. Many newspapers were unable to understand why, if the purpose of the censorship was to keep information from the enemy, American publications could not tell their readers of news which was being freely cabled about through the rest of the world. Dissatisfaction deepened later on when the Committee asked that a speech delivered in London by the American Ambassador, and published there, be withheld from publication in this country.

The Committee's statement of July 30 said quite clearly that the requests did not apply in any fashion to opinion or criticism. As time went on, however, some of the special cautions and complaints which emanated from those in charge of administering voluntary censorship were interpreted in the newspaper world as bearing more strongly on editorial policy than on security. This did not help the popularity of voluntary censorship.

On top of all this, a good many complications and embarrassments arose from the fact that the Committee on Public Information also was in the business of propaganda, so that its motives were sometimes suspected; and the further fact that branch offices, established at numerous points, naturally did not always agree in their interpretation of the original requests.

Taking the record all in all, it is quite evident that the efforts of the Committee resulted in keeping out of circulation a vast amount of information which would have been valuable to the enemy. It is equally impossible to escape the conviction that the effort fell far short

of its goal, due to misunderstandings and irritations. Years afterward, it was disclosed by George Creel, the Chairman of the Committee, that he soon became disgusted with the whole venture and considered it a failure.

It was against this historical background that voluntary press censorship was again undertaken a few days after the attack on Pearl Harbor. On December 16, 1941, the President announced the appointment of a Director of Censorship, using these words:

"All Americans abhor censorship, just as they abhor war. But the experience of this and of all other nations has demonstrated that some degree of censorship is essential in war time, and we are at war.

"The important thing now is that such forms of censorship as are necessary shall be administered effectively and in harmony with the best interests of our free institutions."

As in 1917, various approaches to a voluntary system had been made in advance through isolated requests issued by various branches of the government. The first was a Navy request early in 1941 for secrecy regarding the repair of British warships in American shipyards. The Maritime Commission, the Weather Bureau, and various other agencies followed with requests of their own. Obviously the first thing for the new Office of Censorship to do was to tie these requests together, eliminate those which seemed unnecessary, and draft others so that the field would be covered comprehensively and in organized fashion.

Fortunately, the undertaking was launched without bitterness in any quarter. The declaration of the President for a voluntary system of censorship was hailed generally by the press, which came forward with a universal pledge of coöperation. There had been no prelude of controversy in Congress as in the case of the First World War. It is quite true that some disagreements had arisen within the Administration itself. The President had been urged strongly by some of his higher-ranking aides to ask Congress for a compulsory censorship statute. He had declined to do so. But all of this controversy, such as it was, had taken place within confidential official precincts, and no public incident developed. On the whole the venture of 1941 was launched on smooth waters.

The problem of codifying the government's requests was far from a simple one. Fevered day and night conferences among the government agencies and with representatives of the newspaper industry ensued. The United States government, already gigantic and complex almost beyond belief, was expanding its operations rapidly in the first desperate effort to grapple with a surprise attack. Even at the last

moment, when we thought the provisions of the new Code had been pretty well settled, and we were about to make them public, we discovered that another government agency without any authority at all had prepared a complicated code of its own and was in the act of announcing it to the press of the country. It was more by luck than otherwise that we were able to learn of this prospective development and forestall it.

The President's statement of December 16, 1941, was the rock upon which we were attempting to build, and it has remained ever since the true foundation of all of our operations. In addition to declaring that censorship of the press should be voluntary, the words of the statement laid down three cardinal principles: that censorship was an instrument of war, that censorship must be so administered as to be effective, that this was to be an American censorship, in harmony "with the best interests of our free institutions."

As to the first of these considerations, there was little difficulty in theory but much complication in practice. Everyone recognized, as an abstract proposition, that requests to the press ought to be confined to matters related to the war and to national security. Nevertheless, when it came to concrete cases, there was no absence of attempts to smuggle into the Code certain things which might suit the convenience of the government but which dealt with peace-time statutes or with situations where the war effort, as such, was only remotely involved.

The invariable method of dealing with these situations was to inquire over and over just what issue of national security was involved. In other words, the Office of Censorship adopted at the very beginning the old legal stratagem of requiring the litigant to "show cause." Unless a definite consideration of national security could be shown, the request was omitted from the Code. That has been the policy ever since.

The second stipulation of the President was that censorship must be "administered effectively" even though there was no statute behind it. Obviously this meant that confidence in our operation had to be established, not only on the side of the press but on the side of the government itself. In other words, to be effective, the Code must be recognized by other government agencies, including the armed forces, as sufficient to cover the needs of security; and it must be recognized by the press as reasonable and workable.

We had always on the one hand the possibility that some powerful government department would lose faith in the virility of our program and would initiate a broad-gauge censorship crusade on its own account in a zealous effort to fill the gap. We had always on

the other hand the possibility that some individual newspaper or magazine, or group, would lose faith in our honest intentions and our reasonableness and would decline to have any part in the experiment.

This dilemma we sought to resolve, as best we could, by once more applying strictly the rule of national security. The Code is based throughout on a belief that no government agency has a right to be unreasonable in its requests and that the press will be willing always to accept and abide by any request which can be defended on the score of reasonableness. In such a manner only could effective censorship be established.

Finally, the President stipulated that we must remember we were dealing with free institutions. This meant that relations with the press must not be harsh or bureaucratic. It meant also that there was to be no infringement upon the guarantee in the First Amendment.

Much has been said about the seeming incongruity of the terms "censorship" and "free press" and there always is a certain bristling when any restraint whatever is put upon the operation of a printing press. The cry of government meddling and interference with free expression always is an especially handy tool for politicians when censorship in any guise enters the arena. But there is a reasonable basis for distinction here as there is everywhere else in law and practical government.

The rights conferred by the First Amendment are by no means absolute rights. No one would contend, for instance, that freedom of the press meant a freedom to commit libel or slander or to indulge in indecency of expression. When it is examined in all of its aspects, the Constitutional guarantee resolves itself into a guarantee of freedom to express opinion, to petition, to criticize, to protest. The language of the Amendment certainly cannot be reasonably stretched to include a guarantee of freedom to be criminally careless with information in war time, or to commit treason, which is expressly dealt with in another clause of the Constitution.

It is, therefore, the basic characteristic of the present Code and of all of our incidental relations with the domestic press that the Office of Censorship in no way and to no degree seeks to influence editorial opinion.

Such is the theory of our present censorship of the domestic press. Space does not permit a detailed discussion of actual experience, but it is appropriate to recognize, in conclusion, that no one can claim perfection either for what has been attempted or for what has been accomplished.

From an operational viewpoint, the weakness of voluntary censorship has lain not so much in the lack of legal penalties as in the vast expanse of the American publishing industry and the inevitable differences of interpretation which arise among editors widely separated and always under the pressure of approaching deadlines. This disadvantage would arise whether there were penalties or not. It is inescapable under any system which stops short of absolute government regimentation, with every line of type controlled exactly by one central authority.

Censorship, for example, issues its rule book—a set of requests written as plainly as a trained staff can write them after long consultation with the war agencies and the industry. Yet whatever the painstaking effort, no Code can be devised which covers every human possibility exactly. Hence the event is always happening which is either just outside the letter, but inside the purpose of the mind of the censor.

A painstaking editor will think this through, will see that a security issue may conceivably be involved despite the loophole left by the language of the Code, and will decide to give security the benefit of the doubt and put the story on the dead-hook. His neighbor, however, may be more literal-minded, less thoughtful, more influenced by lifelong habits of initiative formed in the hard school of journalistic competition.

Not only does such a situation present a pretty tangle for those who administer censorship, but it weakens by just so much the strategic position of that school of thought which clings to the voluntary theory. If dangerous information gets into print through such a succession of events, the doubters shake their heads, and there is an audible rustling of bills and resolutions which propose to deal with censorship on a statutory basis. The advocates of such measures do not split hairs. They are not inclined to be impressed with the virtues of a free press in time of war. They are not schooled to be concerned about the problems of the press or of the people, but only with the immediate physical problems of making war on the battlefield.

The desertions from the French warships in American harbors early in 1943, the Guadalcanal sit-down reports, and certain aspects of the Darlan episode in North Africa all fell within this foggy area of being partly but not too explicitly covered by the language of the Code. In each instance there was some trace of a security issue, yet no book of rules brief enough to be workable could ever cover these or similar situations with finite thoroughness. Should some borderline case arise where innocently intended but thoughtless publication

actually and visibly cost American lives, there might easily be a public opinion over night that voluntary censorship had failed.

This is the Field of Darkness. It is well that every devotee of a free press understand the danger. Yet we must not be dismayed by it, for, after all, these are simply the hazards which every free institution must face in time of world upheaval.

The important consideration is that we recognize the perils, but never lose our faith. With all their faults, free institutions still are best; and with all its weaknesses, voluntary censorship still is vastly to be desired above all other methods of dealing with a free press in war time.

A graduate of the University of Oregon, Mr. Hoyt entered newspaper work at Pendleton, Oregon. He took a job on the copy-desk of the *Portland Oregonian* in 1923, became its managing editor ten years later, and has been its publisher since 1938. He was with the A.E.F. in France in World War I, advancing to the rank of Sergeant-Major. He is national president of Sigma Delta Chi, professional journalistic fraternity. Since writing the following article, Mr. Hoyt has become the Domestic Director of the OWI, succeeding Gardner Cowles, Jr.

THE USE AND ABUSE OF RESTRAINTS

By PALMER HOYT

Applied unwisely, wartime censorship can destroy the very purpose it seeks to serve.

For example, the one hundred per cent application of black-out censorship in Japan will help the Allies beat Japan. Because of complete lack of knowledge by the people of Japan, mistakes like those made in the Bismarck Sea will be made again and again. There is no outcry from Japan for the removal of inefficient military leaders because the people are told that all is well and that victory lurks around every corner.

Proper censorship which covers both the sins of omission and commission is a buckler in time of national peril. It should be kept brightly polished and the tarnished spots of improper application should be rubbed away as quickly as they are seen.

Some of the practices indulged in under the general excuse of military or naval security smack of the thought processes of the Middle Ages.

If Byron Price, or his assistant N. R. Howard, could decide every question of what is proper and improper to print, American newspapers would be as happy as month-old lambs on a green lawn in the warmth of May sunshine; but this, of course, is impossible.

The present system of the application of censorship filters down through military, naval, and civilian "authorities," many of whom are unfamiliar with the war-time censorship Code; in fact, there are cases where military censors have never heard of it.

To state an extreme case, a reporter who insisted on quoting the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* in his newspaper could perhaps wind up in the Federal penitentiary. An experienced San Francisco newsman informed me recently that a description of California's mineral resources from the *Britannica* was thrown out of his copy for the *San Francisco Chronicle* because it betrayed military secrets.

The *Congressional Record,* too, is a source of great confusion to censors generally. The historic case of the *New York Times'* article about plans for building battleships in Brooklyn roused the ire of the Navy Department. The writer of the article was accused of revealing vital military information. When questioned as to his authority, his answer, "The *Congressional Record!*" placed his critics immediately back on their own one-yard line.

In Portland, Oregon, a recent incident clearly illustrates the confusion which exists as to what is being published by interested governments. Conversations were being held by the *Oregonian* with the Navy relative to the release of pictures of the new aircraft carrier, H. M. S. *Tracker,* built at the Willamette Iron and Steel plant in Portland, for the British Admiralty. For weeks, the conversations went on. Finally U. S. Navy representatives agreed that Portland newspapers might print pictures, but took great care to see that these photographs were made innocuous by covering up all essential details. At the very time release was being held up, there arrived on the managing editor's desk a booklet put out by the British Information Service containing photographs and detailed sketches of the principal craft in the British Navy, including aircraft carriers.

Then there is the little matter of the weather. For many years, newspapermen have considered weather important news. It's an old adage that everybody talks about the weather. Some newspapers have gone to the extent of carrying a front page weather story every day, and I have always thought that was a sound idea. Before war and food rationing, it was generally considered the number one topic. It still ranks high. Newspapers in the war-zone areas, particularly, have had their troubles in describing the antics of old Sol, Jupiter Pluvius, and their allies.

For almost a year after Pearl Harbor, any mention of Portland weather was banned, interdict, and *verboten* for forty-eight hours. In other words, if it was snowing locally, people could not learn this fact from the newspapers or radio, but had to ascertain it by looking out the window. This difficult practice was no doubt indulged in by Japanese spies. There was always a lot of sense in curtailing publication of regional weather round-up stories, but never any sense to the

abridgment of the right to publish purely local weather conditions, which were *fait accompli.*

Under the revised regulations, provision has been made that "past tense" weather stories may be printed, save only that blocking of a military highway may not be revealed until it is cleared. Temperatures and wind directions are held up for at least twenty-four hours. Such stories may be printed within the particular state involved or within one hundred and fifty miles of the origin of the storm.

During last winter's exceptionally heavy snowstorms, metropolitan Seattle was blocked by drifts. A story describing this unusual condition was moved by the United Press, marked "cleared for publication." The Associated Press came forth with a conflicting view. They held that the story was censorable and improper. The *Oregonian* checked with the West Coast Command. The first report indicated that the story was o.k. Later we were advised that a mistake had been made and that the story should be censored, but by that time the dispatch had been broadcast throughout eleven western states.

This matter was called to the attention of the West Coast Command. The following reply was given: "Well, if anyone gets in trouble you want to be in the clear, don't you?" However, the *Oregonian* eventually printed a follow-up story without further authority from the military, because by checking the maps our editors ascertained that, whereas Portland is 185 miles from Seattle by rail or highway, it was less than one hundred and fifty miles by direct air route. Thus, a type of story which had previously been apparently banned by the Code became perfectly proper for the *Oregonian* to use.

The matter of weather regulations brings up a point to be borne in mind by all newspapers—that is, that despite the war-time censorship Code, and despite the OWI and all the other regulatory bodies, final responsibility for many decisions rests with the news man on the news desk.

It has long been my contention that no one who is an American or a newspaperman wants to do anything, say anything, or write anything that can be of "aid and comfort" to the enemy. Often our boys quarrel with releases out of Washington because they feel that the judgment used was bad. In other words, they feel the particular dispatch may well give "aid and comfort" to the enemy.

In the early days of the war, the *Chicago Sun* offered us a story which said that the first American convoy, bound for Australia, was at sea. The *Oregonian* managing editor and his assistant talked this matter over and refused to print the story. I think our editors were one-hundred-percent right. To me, this story was highly improper.

It should be reiterated that the adherence to the war-time Code does not relieve the working newspaperman of the exercise of his own responsible judgment.

Last summer, with humidity approaching an all-time low, numerous forest fires were under way in the Pacific Northwest. Forest officials were extremely worried lest the situation get out of control. The Code at that time did not make specific mention of forest fires; yet by applying the basic admonition of the Code, "Is this information I would like to have if I were the enemy?" it appeared obvious that the true state of affairs should not be disclosed. The hazard becomes apparent when one recalls that a Japanese plane, launched last summer from a submarine, dropped incendiaries on an Oregon coast forest area.

At the same time, we felt an obligation to inform the public, particularly in regard to the need for caution; a careless cigarette could prove just as formidable as an enemy incendiary. Edward M. Miller, acting managing editor, called the local head of the OWI. What did he advise?

"I'd print it. Tell the public the facts. But of course, I have no authority to tell you what to do." Okay, thanks.

Next, the head of the local weather bureau. Same question. "I wouldn't print that. But of course I can't tell you what to do." Thanks.

Then a call to the public relations office of the Fourth Army at Seattle—Captain (now Major) Phil Sinnott. What did he think?

"I suggest that you call the regional forester in your city (Portland) and discuss the matter with him. Anything you and he work out will, I am sure, be satisfactory with us." So to the regional forester with the now familiar question: "What do you think we should do?" To which the forester replied: "What do *you* think?"

And that's where the responsibility rested, right where it started, at the managing editor's desk. Coöperative head-scratching on the part of the news man and the forest man produced news articles calculated to warn the public of the need for sustained caution—without revealing critical details for the benefit of saboteurs or foreign agents.

Another incident which required judgment on the part of our editors was the shelling of the Oregon coast in June, 1942. The circumstances you will recall. An enemy submarine came down from Alaska, lay off the Oregon shore, and lobbed a dozen shells at Fort Stevens. Fort Stevens did not respond. No damage was done, but America had received its first enemy shells over the old home plate. It was a tremendous story nationally and a "gigantic" locally. Don McLeod,

one of the *Oregonian's* ace reporters, was in charge as acting night city editor. He first called the public relations office of the Thirteenth Naval District, Seattle. After some debate, they decided that because the shells were directed toward an Army fort, it was an Army matter. Attempts to get a responsible Army source to release the story drew a blank.

McLeod conferred with Robert C. Notson, managing editor, at his home, and was directed by him to prepare a story giving the bare facts of the attack. It was agreed that the plain language of the Code sanctioned the publication of that much. Before it was put into print the AP picked it up and sent it to San Francisco, where its bureau submitted it to the Army public relations office. The latter asked that it be withheld. While the immediate request affected only the AP, the *Oregonian* also complied.

About 3:30 a.m. the Army finally released the story. The *Oregonian's* home delivered edition was already printed, but an extra was issued. Subsequently, Mr. Notson submitted the question to N. R. Howard, of the press section of the censorship office. Mr. Howard ruled that the Code permitted publication of the fact that there had been an attack, but pointed out that once the matter had been submitted to the West Coast Command, orders from that source superseded the Code.

I recite this incident to show that generally officers in the field apply restrictive measures considerably beyond the language of the Code, and that it is often difficult for the newspaper editor to determine correct procedure under the stress of circumstance.

An amusing sequel to the story came a day or two later, when I received a call from the Thirteenth Naval District objecting strenuously to our publication of the story. My question was "What possible reason could there have been for holding it up?" The answer, "Well, we didn't want the story released until we determined the objective the submarine had."

Actually, the real objective of the submarine's visit may never be ascertained; thus, we might never have published the story. In this case, full credit goes to DeWitt's outfit for finally giving us permission to run the story.

One of the practical difficulties of actual censorship procedure from the standpoint of the newspaper is the confusion that exists as to who should be contacted to clear a particular story. Military and naval commanders in the field have demonstrated a most understandable reticence about clearing stories.

Also, a newspaper must move rapidly if it is to print facts while

they are still news. Frequently the unwinding of departmental red tape is most distressing to the trained newspaper worker, who is inclined to feel that officers, untrained in the legitimate desire of the public for prompt information, err on the side of extreme caution, and unnecessarily so.

By way of illustration, we might consider the efforts of Puget Sound papers some months ago to get a release on the torpedoing of a ship off the Washington coast. No naval source would sanction the release. Meanwhile, survivors had been landed and the information had become almost common property. Still the Navy made no release. Finally the papers remembered that under the Code a member of Congress was an "appropriate source," and they placed the matter before Representative Warren Magnuson, who released the story.

However, we should remember that those cases are in themselves often minor irritations. Commanders have not learned how to inform our public properly without giving away information to the enemy—but we are all learning.

The managing director of our radio station clears everything through the Office of Censorship in Washington, has no trouble, and finds a high degree of coöperation. It is operated by trained news men who appreciate the importance of prompt action. It is proper that radio should consult the censorship bureau, because radio is not primarily a news initiating agency. Furthermore, radio crosses international boundaries, and the character of material it handles must be more carefully screened to prevent escape of important facts to the enemy.

In recent months, the Navy has maintained a public relations officer at Portland who has been most useful in passing on pictures and stories. When he has been in doubt, or could not be reached, Nard Jones, in the office of the Thirteenth Naval District at Seattle, has given prompt and efficient service. Occasionally, matters go to Washington but the response from there has been somewhat slower for various reasons. Of late, even this has been improving.

The Army set-up has been less well defined in this area, with stories originating in many points. The Army Intelligence has an office in Portland which censors photographs of military concern but none to advise with reference to news. The public relations office of the West Coast Command at San Francisco has rendered efficient service. However, it is impossible to take to San Francisco—a thousand miles away—every story which might come under the Code. As a result, we have had to apply the rule of common sense as outlined by Mr. Price: "Will this information be of aid to the enemy?" If in doubt, we refer the

question to the Presidio. So far, this arrangement, with the knowledge of the public relations officer at the Presidio, has worked very well.

Apparently, and despite the published statements of Elmer Davis, the OWI branches throughout the country do usurp some functions of censorship. The recent case in Los Angeles where an attempt was made by the OWI to establish a dictatorship over all war agencies is well known. This abortive attempt to misuse the authority of OWI was nipped in the bud by Gardner Cowles, Jr., with efficiency and dispatch. However, OWI officers are still clearing matters which would seem to be peculiarly the function of the Office of Censorship.

An example of more than passing interest was the case of a radio program for the Office of Civilian Defense which was barred on the authority of Dean Jennings, West Coast regional director of OWI. The program, originating in Portland, designed to broadcast nationally over the Columbia network, was the dramatization of the first bombing of the American mainland by the Japanese. The incident took place last summer near Brookings, Oregon, which is a heavily forested region. The script was done by a nationally famous fiction writer and should have been the basis for a good show. Mr. Jennings ruled out the broadcast on two counts: (1) that it was not established that the Japanese were responsible for the bombing, and (2) that the government did not wish to alarm the residents of timber areas on the coast.

Let's examine Mr. Jennings' objections for a moment. The first thesis is impossible. It's a well established fact that a small Japanese plane—probably taking off from a submarine—dropped two small incendiary bombs in the Port Orford Cedar Forest, with which the Japanese have been familiar for many years. The news of the bombing was printed at the time, and the former governor of Oregon has on his desk an engraved souvenir of the occasion from General DeWitt, head of the West Coast Army Command, in commemoration of "the first bombing of the American mainland by the Japanese." As to the second objection, it may be dismissed as ill advised. One of the great problems in the West Coast area, which has been listed as a combat zone since December 7, is the fact that the residents of our western states have not taken the war seriously. Surely such a program would bring to the mind of our public the fact that we are in enemy range.

The handling of the occupation of the Aleutians by the Navy would seem to require a lot of explanation. At a time when Americans definitely needed forthright appraisals so that as a nation it might gear

itself more intelligently to the war effort, the news of the serious of the situation in those strategic islands was held up for five weeks.

There was far too much unnecessary and improper mystery in connection with the gallant flight of General Doolittle and the bombing of Tokyo. Silence in the initial phases could be easily understood because of the necessity of getting the American flyers out of occupied China, but the continued delay of the government to divulge all the facts threw discredit and doubt on a courageous leader who was forced to make misstatements of fact because of the exigencies of a war-time crisis. The announcement by the Japanese weeks after the flight that they had captured the crews of two American bombers finally gained a reluctant confirmation from a War Department which had categorically denied the loss of a single American aviator in the "bombing action." Later the Japanese claimed the capture of four American aviators; the War Department admitted four. Then the Japs claimed eight; we admitted eight. This seems to be the right figure, but the method of the admission did our government no good.

Censorship of the mails, particularly from Alaska, which has drawn fire in the Congress, should, of course, be continued. But if the by-practice of using quotations from censored letters for political purposes is still going on, it should be discontinued. Furthermore, senseless deletions, such as the names of towns in the United States, because the Code says that no town in Alaska can be mentioned, should be eliminated.

Censorship should not be used by government as a political weapon. The propulsion and emphasizing of certain types of news favorable to the Admiinstration which goes out to foreign lands presents another definite question. This works both ways, too. Correspondents returning from North Africa state they are permitted to write articles that support the Administration's policy in North Africa, while articles critical of it are repressed.

Some time ago it was decided that no talk made in America could be released to the British press until after delivery. England being five hours earlier than the eastern United States, this prevented the publication of such speeches in the morning press. The speeches, of course, would be dead news for the afternoon papers; hence many talks which would have been of great interest to the British public never saw the light of day. The rule was to apply both to private and official citizens. Thus, Wendell Willkie's remarks as leader of the American opposition were barred. However, shortly after the rule was put into effect, exception was made of a speech by Vice President Wallace.

These, and other matters, are of the gravest importance to those

persons interested in preserving the greatest possible proportion of democratic procedure of wartime. We should never forget, whether we be officials of government or private citizens, what Elmer Davis said when he took over as head of OWI: "America must deal with the truth. . . . This is a people's war; and to win it, the people should know as much about it as they can. The view of this official is that everything should be printed if it does not endanger the national security."

I said in a national broadcast from Seattle on August 6: "There is no basis in fact for the idea that Americans can not take bad news; nor should there be any attempt to sweeten the dose by holding it until there can be good news to coat it."

In closing I would like to quote four more paragraphs from that same radio discussion. The facts presented were applicable then; they are applicable now.

"I am sure that Americans would go barefoot in the streets if that would insure victory. But to clothe themselves with such a psychology, Americans must be sure that privation is necessary; that it stems from fact, and not from the theoretical conclusions of some so-called expert.

"In war time the most important asset that any government can have is public confidence. Such public confidence is more than important to a democracy in dire peril such as ours—it is vital. Today our government does not have the confidence of the people to the extent essential to all-out victory. It does not have it because the people do not feel that the government has been realistic about the facts of this, the people's war for survival.

"The government has repeatedly failed properly to report unfavorable war news. Often the first word of disaster has come from enemy broadcasts which, in turn, have helped to authenticate potentially dangerous propaganda—and, more important, it has reflected directly on the reliability of our own government's reports. Too often such government failures have been attributed to the necessity for military secrecy—too often military secrecy has not justified misleading reports.

"No one—be it from the press or the public—wants to give 'aid and comfort' to the enemy. No one wants to violate necessary 'naval and military security.' But, by the same token, public and press alike wonder whether the naval and military establishments are awake to the fact that there is something greater than naval security, something greater than military security, and that is, American security—faith in ourselves—faith in our leadership—faith in our government! No one wants to help the enemy, but none can endorse a policy of silence

if it be utilized to give aid and comfort to men responsible for our military or civil failures."

The commentator in the British official film, "Desert Victory," gives voice to this observation: "A citizen army fights best when it knows what is going on." That is a word of counsel which our military and government leaders should ponder—not only as regards the men in the field, but also with reference to the great civilian army required to back them up. The people at home, who furnish the money, the weapons, and the boys to do the dying also "fight best when they know what is going on."

If that be a weakness of democracy at war, it is also the paramount strength of democracy at war.

The present managing editor of the *Christian Science Monitor* graduated from Bates College and then went to Oxford as a Rhodes Scholar. He began newspaper work as a reporter for the *Monitor* in 1925, and later covered events in Europe and the Far East for that paper. He was the head of the *Monitor's* Washington bureau from 1932 to 1939.

THE BATTLE FOR NEWS

By ERWIN D. CANHAM

How goes the battle for the facts?

Most American editors, surveying the war scene from the detachment of their offices, would probably conclude that their readers are getting a fair and adequate report of world events. In fact, they might boast about it, and with some reason.

Most war correspondents, grappling with the problems of censorship in a particular area, would insist that many important facts—some of them of no visible aid to the enemy—have been withheld.

The public would tend to agree with the correspondent. There is a growing and disturbing feeling among newspaper readers that a great deal of information is held back. Newspaper editors nowadays are constantly greeted with the remark: "You fellows must know a lot you don't print." Unfortunately, we do. We know many things we would not seek to print under any circumstances. We know other things that we earnestly believe should be printed, but can't be. And we know that there is a good deal we don't know, until returning correspondents or soldiers and sailors and airmen tell us about it.

This is no blanket condemnation of the Office of Censorship, which is so ably and equitably conducted by Byron Price. It is a criticism of the bureaucratic decisions of the military mind, particularly of the petty and local military mind. It is a criticism of the considered policy of several of our Allies. It is a criticism of the newspaperman's limitations. And, of course, it is a criticism of decisions and tendencies to suppress that have been growing in President Roosevelt.

When all this is said, it should be added that the criticisms are relative. We have much to be proud of in our news-gathering and dispensing system. The American people know more of the facts of this war than the people of any other country. I think I could justify that statement, although Robert Brennan, the Irish Minister to the United States, recently insisted to me that the compressed version of war news presented to the Irish people in the four-page newspapers of Dublin constituted the best war coverage in the world. It may be that there are some journalistic advantages in neutrality!

Yet the picture presented in American newspapers is much more full and graphic than any found elsewhere. It brings the war home in an exceedingly vivid manner. Our standards of war reporting have been improving steadily as American war correspondents have learned just how grim this kind of war can be. And the obstacles put in the way of our correspondents have been growing appreciably less. So I stick to the statement that with all its faults, American war-fact telling is as good as there is.

But of course it is not good enough. Let me begin my criticisms at home. I do not think we have done well enough in telling the ups and downs of war production. There were some security reasons why lags and obstacles in production could not be revealed in their earlier stages. But, as an editor, I still feel unsatisfied with the story we are getting. I do not feel confident, for instance, that the facts of Willow Run have been adequately told. At least, as a citizen who is professionally equipped to follow these things, I am far from sure of the causes of that disappointment. There are many other aspects of production—including some matters partially investigated by the Truman Committee—which cry out for elucidation. We have heard little about war profits. Are we sure that some new-style Teapot Domes are not brewing? What about aluminum? What about the Shipshaw power project in Canada, etc., etc.?

Only the other day I received the copy of a feature article on the waste of man-hours in war production. It was written by a shipyard worker on the Pacific Coast, and we are going to print it. It revealed a situation that may be pretty wide-spread. The author claimed, with documenting instances, that most workers in his plant—which rates well in the nation—were wasting an hour or more apiece each day. I hear just the same stories from numerous workers in shipyards in the Boston area. A Commissioner of Industrial Welfare in an important manufacturing state, who happened to call at my office this week, vigorously confirmed the stories. This official said that in most plants where production is on a cost-plus basis or its

equivalent, there is little or no effort to use labor economically, and vast wastage results. It is a wastage which, if properly applied, could produce hundreds of escort vessels or airplanes or vast quantities of foodstuffs.

There is no reason why a better job of reporting could not be done on the manpower-use situation. It would help to shorten the war. It is, in many ways, just as important as spectacular campaigns on the fighting fronts. And yet the story is ignored for a variety of reasons: fear to tread on the toes of management or to insult labor, patriotic disinclination to belittle our efforts, and just plain apathy in the fact of a difficult and unusual job. And what is the connection between manpower waste and absenteeism? Or housing, or child care, or shopping difficulties? A valuable news reporting job could be done in any of these fields.

I do not believe we give the public all the labor news it needs to know. Mine is not the familiar charge that the newspapers are unfriendly to labor. It is that, in too many cases, we simply do not unearth and publish the essential facts in labor relations—pro or con. This is particularly true of local papers. A year or two ago, we sent a reporter to a good-sized city where a big strike was on. The story was on the front pages—in versions of varying completeness—of most metropolitan newspapers. There was not a line about the strike in the local paper. "Too hot to handle," said the editor. "It's all right for you fellows to come in and write stories. We have to live with these folks, tomorrow and next day and next year, and we couldn't print the stories you do." We appreciate his problem, but his solution wasn't the one that has made American newspapers great and courageous.

How many newspapers gave genuinely adequate and clear factual explanations of why the coal miners so blindly follow John L. Lewis? In how many newspapers was the headlining and emphasis of this part of the story really balanced? National unity, internal understanding, are important to the war effort. News-coverage which by its shortcomings helps to perpetuate or widen rifts between our great groups of Americans is seriously derelict in war time.

In many aspects of the domestic news report, a superb job is being done. Washington is being well covered. We often get grand stories of the achievements of war production. Such agencies as the Truman Committee furnish news-material for healthy criticism. The various rationing situations have been well covered. And in the field of crusading—such as the scrap or war-loan drives—the newspapers have proved their power and influence. But let us not forget the

things we aren't telling; let us call forth all the resources of reporting and editing that we can command; let us make sure that no inadequacies in the press itself are keeping a full factual picture from reaching the American people.

* * *

The reporting of war news is a larger and more serious story. Here, as stated above, the American people are probably doing as well or better than any other nation. But many editors and correspondents who were active in the last war have reached the conclusion that the part of our censorship which is in military hands is more restrictive and short-sighted than it was in 1917-18.

Paul Scott Mowrer, editor of the *Chicago Daily News* and a foreign correspondent of wide experience, writes in the *Public Opinion Quarterly:*

"Ask any competent war correspondent or Washington correspondent. Each will say the same. The handling of war information in this war has not been up to the best American standards. In the last war, under President Wilson, General Pershing, and Colonel Frederick Palmer, himself a veteran war correspondent, we had an excellent system which functioned to the general satisfaction. Yet when this war broke out, the government had apparently no plan for war correspondents. Everything had to be improvised, confusedly, and in conditions which at times amounted almost to panic."

As an editor who, like Mr. Mowrer, is in daily touch with an extensive staff of war correspondents, I can confirm his conclusions. Time and time again, our military and naval censors in this war have made petty and absurd decisions. The responsibility goes back to the top bureaucrats. I find it hard to blame the subordinate officer who could be and sometimes is penalized for what he passes, but is never blamed by his superiors for what he keeps back.

Censorship is particularly difficult when things are going badly. Then even the local commanders, generally eager to have their story told, are disinclined to release the news. And for a year or more of this war, things were going badly for America. Many facts were held back under circumstances which are hard to defend.

A war correspondent who was at Pearl Harbor, and has served before and since at many other vital areas, says:

"The greatest single example of stupid censorship was at Pearl Harbor. Behind it was the general hysteria which gripped the naval high command after the shock. They were terrified to let anything out, partly because too many naval reputations were at stake. Orders were given to apply a blind censorship. The actual censors entrusted

with the job were incapable of interpreting the order intelligently, and the fat was in the fire. Of course it ended in a blow-up and it was straightened out quite satisfactorily.

"There isn't much point in arguing the other question about the justification for keeping back the truth about what happened at Pearl Harbor. Admiral King still seems convinced that to tell more would have aided the enemy. I don't know. You were in this country and can judge far better than I can whether the harm done to public confidence outweighed the value of whatever information we kept from the enemy. I personally think the Japs knew exactly what happened, not from aerial observation but from the fact that even mediocre espionage in Honolulu would have provided them with immediate factual reports through any one of a number of different easy channels—most plausibly through 'neutral' consular officials. They could have obtained the facts within forty-eight hours at the outside. Transmitting them via South America would have been elementary. I just assume, perhaps wrongly, that it was done. The fact that Japanese propaganda broadcasts consistently gave a slightly garbled version can just as easily be put down to protecting their own sources of information as it can be to ignorance."

Another correspondent has given me a vivid account of his difficulties with the censorship in the Middle East. He says:

"Nobody will quarrel with the importance of suppressing information that would furnish aid and comfort to the enemy. But the application and interpretation of this formula by official censors armed with blue pencils leads into all kinds of pitfalls. Not only are censors human and likely to err, but as a rule they are not very bright or they would not be assigned a job which is considered in the army dull and routine. The higher-ups display their lack of confidence in the censors' individual judgment by providing for their rigid guidance long lists of rules and 'stops' that are constantly being amended and extended. For example, a mimeographed slip will be circulated to the effect that there is to be a complete stop on mention of Australians, or tank busters, or speculation on military operations. Sometimes there are good grounds for these stops. Often they are quite absurd, as when certain adjectives or nouns are arbitrarily stricken from the reporter's vocabulary. At one time there was a complete stop in the Middle East on the word 'surprise.'

"The trouble with rigid rules and stops is that no foolproof mechanical process for winnowing newspaper copy ever has been or can be devised.

"Censors who work mechanically are quite likely to let valuable

information slip by if it doesn't happen to be covered by one of the rules. Thus last summer, a group of correspondents was officially charged by General Auchinleck with divulging information about future operations which forced a complete change of plan. A terrific hue and cry was raised against the press by all the various people around GHQ who were only too anxious for such an opportunity. For a while a directive was enforced that no intelligence officer in the field should be permitted to talk to correspondents except in the presence of a conductive officer who should take detailed notes on the conversation. The effect of this was naturally to make them shut up like so many clams.

"In every army, even one pledged to fight against Nazism and Fascism, one finds people who are temperamentally opposed to freedom of the press. Perhaps there is something about uniforms and army regimentation that fosters and encourages such sentiments. But there are always some of them around who will jump at any chance to muzzle or discredit the press men. For instance, last August, after Churchill returned from Moscow and was busy around Cairo with military matters every bawab (or janitor) and every safragi (or servant) knew the PM was around. Espionage in Cairo was active. The press, however, was forbidden to mention the PM's presence from Cairo. Then, however, the BBC announced the fact. The various agency men naturally were bombarded with queries. The stop nevertheless remained despite all efforts to get it lifted. Finally, when the news interest had faded, the press was granted a collective interview with the PM. One of our members, Mr. Lumbey of the *London Times*, as our appointed spokesman, took the floor and in a very polite, dignified and *Times*-like manner proceeded to voice to the PM our collective complaint over the behavior of the censorship anent the visit.

"The next day all correspondents were summoned to a meeting where Col. Phillpotts, who as deputy director of public relations in the Middle East also directed the censorship, accused us of a breach of army discipline for 'annoying' the PM, declared that we were not doing our jobs and that he had therefore decided to appoint 'officer observers' who would write for the press, and added that there were altogether too many correspondents in the Middle East anyway and that he would take steps through the War Office to have some disaccredited. This, to the British correspondents especially, was a very thinly veiled threat that they had better watch out, or else. . . . Phillpotts then stamped out of the room, slinging over his shoulder as a parting shot, 'All of you look just as dreadful to me as I do to you.' Next day he declared the correspondents' association dissolved, that

he would no longer treat with our elected spokesmen but only with us as individuals. Any dispatches or even service messages on these proceedings were stopped cold by the censor.

"It would seem as though censorship, even when starting with a purely legitimate and praiseworthy objective such as keeping information from the enemy, tends by some law of dynamics to expand and overreach itself, until, if we aren't careful, all forms of freedom of expression are endangered. That is why any newspaperman, while seeking to coöperate in not divulging information of value to the enemy (and paradoxically this is the one thing which censorship is almost powerless to prevent without such coöperation), must constantly be vigilant and on the lookout against attempts to destroy freedom of the press and to reduce him to a mere transmitter of official handouts and mouthpiece for doctored news and propaganda. If correspondents are to retain their regard for truth and keep their self-respect they must never relax. The moment we begin to reconcile ourselves to censorship wholeheartedly it's time to watch out; we are slipping or allowing ourselves to be fooled. The free press must keep an even sharper eye on the censor than the censor keeps on the press. There are far too many people in and out of politics who find censorship, introduced purely as a war measure, too convenient a weapon in other fields for other purposes. Beware of the thin end of the wedge."

The foregoing difficulties were with British censors. Since American forces arrived in Egypt, and in the very early days of the North African campaign, correspondents testified that their troubles were even more numerous. Chester Morrison, of the *Chicago Sun*, wrote:

"Between you and me stands the British censorship, which has learned its business; but when an American story comes up, there is also a phalanx of American censors who say in so many words that they are doing me a favor in allowing me to send any kind of story at all. I can't even write around American censors, because they censor everything they personally do not like."

Those of us who have dealt with the military censors in Washington have long and poignant stories to tell. And yet often, with a little leverage, we have been able to get stories through. Perhaps the most turbulent crisis came over accounts of radar, the radio-locating device. As recently as March and April, 1943, many months after the battle to mention radar had been fought and presumably won, we were forbidden certain references to the value of radio locators. Within a few days, we found the same and stronger references—

presumably passed by some other branch of censorship—in widely circulated national advertising. This experience was not isolated. Again, the responsibility was not that of the Office of Censorship. As a matter of fact the Office of War Information and the Office of Censorship deserve most of the credit for the present freedom to discuss radar.

From all this, it might be inferred that the American military and naval censorship is the worst in the world. That is far from the case. Unquestionably, the Russian censorship is the most restrictive in the United Nations world. The reasons are well-known: Russia's fear of espionage and dubious allies. Yet the fact remains that we have known little, in actuality, about the condition of our Russian ally. American correspondents have been sharply constricted in their ability to unearth the facts, and still more hampered in the effort to transmit them.

The censorship in Australia, in the early months after Pearl Harbor, was very stiff. American correspondents were prohibited from writing about various internal problems which were most grave, and even yet have not been fully revealed to Australia's allies in the outside world. The restrictions in Singapore, in India, and in China have been severe.

And, of course, the American outgoing censorship—here the Office of Censorship accepts a large responsibility—has been pretty rigid. The case has been put strongly by Alex Faulkner, American correspondent of the *London Daily Telegraph*, in *Harper's*. To some of us, it does not seem possible to complain of the censorship of other governments when our own is so restrictive, nor right to say that our own censorship has been caused by the prior action of others. It was coolly decided after Pearl Harbor by the American government that a great many events which could be freely publicized in the American press at home would "do no good" if they went beyond our borders. To me, this decision seems profoundly inimical to democracy. I think we would have complained bitterly, and with reason, if the American people had been prevented from hearing of changing development and troubles of internal affairs in Great Britain. I cannot escape the conclusion that our treatment of the outgoing dispatches of allied correspondents in the United States has constituted a sorry chapter in our war information policy, and I believe that even those who stuck by it under attack will regret many extremes of the policy.

Beneath the various and fluctuating efforts of American authority to withhold information beyond the admitted line of "aid and comfort to the enemy" lies the basic viewpoint of President Roosevelt.

His closest press observers, in Washington, are convinced from the evidence that the President has grown weary of the press-watch kept upon him. He revelled in the atmosphere of Casablanca, where for two weeks he and Winston Churchill negotiated in the sunshine without worrying about the reporters. He planned to hold the developing series of United Nations' conferences in the same atmosphere. He sought to travel about the United States without an entourage of correspondents, particularly without interpretative writers.

Against these tendencies, the Washington press corps, the American Society of Newspaper Editors, individual newspapers, opposition politicians, and many ordinary citizens have struck out boldly. This is no time for secret diplomacy, it is agreed, and the President's proposed techniques drifted dangerously into that technique. To prevent any press coverage, until it was all over, of the United Nations Food Conference—as the White House first proposed—was to present public opinion with a diplomatic *fait accompli.* The vigorous protests of the press and its friends succeeded in cracking the doors of that Conference. But all indications are that similarly active protests must continue if we are to protect the status and rights of newspapers in the vital diplomatic period just ahead. It is heartening to realize that the President's best press advisers have tried to deter him from his efforts to sidetrack the press. It may also be charitable to conclude that Mr. Roosevelt—who has a good basic understanding of the press's rôle—was giving way to an aberration partly arising from an understandable weariness.

Where does this all leave us? With the conclusion, surely, that is as old as the newspaper business: constant vigilance is the price of liberty. Newspapers must be unceasing in their efforts to dig out the facts. Their pressure on public authority cannot flag. They must keep up the long struggle with military authority. Only by such efforts will a fair balance be struck. Only thus will the people get enough information to support the kind of democracy that we must have.

A Kansan by birth and education, Mr. Clapper began his newspaper career on the *Kansas City Star.* He later served the United Press for seventeen years, finally becoming manager of its Washington bureau. He has been a political commentator for the Scripps-Howard papers for the past seven years. He has been president of the Gridiron Club and honorary national president of Sigma Delta Chi. .

DISPATCHES GOING ABROAD

By RAYMOND CLAPPER

As with every kind of control that has been necessary in this war, censorship will have a tendency to remain with us. We shall have to be vigilant indeed if, between the friendly nations, a free press and a free exchange of news and opinions are restored.

I have very little complaint myself about the operation of our censorship internally. I have felt no sense of unreasonable restriction in writing my daily column. Actually I have seldom referred any questions to the Office of Censorship. I know that I am free to express any opinion that I care to take the responsibility for. I do not wish to reveal any military information that might be of value to the enemy, and I have had no criticism of the way in which that rule is construed by the Office of Censorship. Others, dealing in spot news perhaps, have had a different experience. But my general observation, apart from my own experience, has been that there is remarkably little complaint among working newspapermen about the Office of Censorship in its domestic activities.

The same cannot be said with regard to our censorship of press dispatches going abroad.

There has been considerable complaint from British and Chinese correspondents stationed in the United States. I have found that the Office of Censorship has stopped some of my own dispatches from going abroad, especially some referring to India. American censors would not permit some of these published references to India to be sent out by Chinese and British correspondents when they attempted

to indicate what kind of comment was being published in the United States. At one time not even any excerpts of what I wrote about India could go abroad.

It is not my purpose here to engage in a controversy as to whether the policy which guided the censors in these particular incidents was sound or not. I happen to think it was not sound. Regardless of that, we know now that our government as well as other governments are formally embarked upon a policy of screening out political comment, and in fact suppressing some spot news of a non-military nature, before it goes out of the country. We do not permit news of lynchings, for instance, and of certain types of labor troubles, to be reported abroad.

Without arguing whether that is justifiable in wartime, we can expect to face a question as to whether that practice shall be continued after the war and during the long armistice.

The theory of censorship originally, so far as we are concerned, was that we did not wish to aid the enemy. That rule has now been expanded to suppress from outgoing dispatches news or opinions that might show disagreements with our allies or that might be exploited by enemy propaganda. It is argued by the Office of Censorship that they are trying to prevent this kind of material falling into enemy hands. Actually, anything that is published in the United States quickly reaches the Axis by way of neutral routes out of the western hemisphere. So the result of the suppression is largely that information is kept only from the reading public of allied countries.

Will that practice continue after the end of the war? I think it is almost certain that an argument will be made for it. The argument will be that the United Nations must be careful what we say to each other. It will be said that we should not permit news or opinions to go abroad that will tend to divide the peoples of the United Nations. It will be argued that although the fighting has stopped, the war of propaganda should continue.

President Roosevelt was very much pleased with the way the Casablanca conference was handled. That is to say, newspaper men were not permitted in the vicinity and were brought in only once for a carefully arranged and restricted press conference at which questions were not permitted. No one was permitted to talk to individuals.

That has given Mr. Roosevelt an idea of how it may be possible to hold United Nations meetings in seclusion. The main purpose is to protect the conferences against bickering in the press that might develop if representatives of the various nations began to air their differing viewpoints to newspaper correspondents. It is also considered

an advantage to relieve responsible leaders of such a conference from the duty of having to meet the press every day.

That carries the whole technique of the controlled press far beyond anything we have experienced in this country. It goes far beyond the sphere of military censorship, and very frankly into political censorship.

Obviously, the reasons which prompt the White House to feel that the United Nations conferences should be isolated from the normal operations of newspaper correspondents will be the same reasons that will be found persuasive after the war. The need for United Nations unity will not diminish with the armistice. The question is whether we want the artificial unity obtained by suppression or the real unity that develops out of the frank discussion which alone can produce a meeting of minds.

So the challenge is here. By the time these observations are in print perhaps there may have been some modification of the proposed policy. I hope so. But the fact that it has been proposed and that newspaper editors have been requested to accept it, is sufficient indication that from now on we may expect various direct and indirect attempts to impose that kind of control on a free press which has been found so convenient by dictators.

I do not mean to say that it does not matter what is printed. It matters very much. An irresponsible press can do fateful damage to international relations. The danger is particularly great while we are in the first stages of bringing together a United Nations organization and when the early shoots are naturally fragile and easily damaged.

But I question whether we do not over-emphasize the danger. A free press is not necessarily an irresponsible press. I go directly to our own government propaganda service itself for evidence of this. The OWI is an enormous organization. It employs dozens of excellent newspaper men and magazine writers, men who have made their reputations in competitive private life. Yet OWI is sending out for American propaganda purposes abroad the actual daily columns of a number of well-known newspaper writers. These are picked up by OWI and sent to many countries and are widely printed. The reason the government takes the actual current columns of these established writers is that it feels the very best propaganda for America that can go out is the genuine, undoctored material that appears in the American press beamed only for the American reader. One OWI field man said when he came back to Washington, "Don't send us anything written especially for the country where I am stationed." He said the public

in that country discounts such hand-tailored propaganda. What they want to read is the real American opinion as it appears in American newspapers.

There, it seems to me, is the answer to those who think the government should retain control over news and opinion going out of the country. There is the best proof of the value of a truly free press. That policy, adopted for very practical reasons by OWI, is the answer to almost any argument that can be put into sheep's clothing to menace democracy.

THE BATTLE FRONTS

In response to a request for an article for the present symposium, the United Press furnished not one but four contributions—all significant and instructive. Harry Ferguson, assistant general news manager, in his letter of transmittal, wrote: "The authors of the four articles all received their journalistic training at the University of Missouri and all have had the advantage of seeing some phase of this war at first hand." Joe Alex Morris, author of the following article, worked on Washington, Tulsa, and Denver papers before he joined the UP as cable editor in 1929. He is now foreign editor of that agency.

THE EUROPEAN INVASION FRONT

By JOE ALEX MORRIS

The job of covering the final stages of the war in Europe is going to be one of the most difficult ever tackled by American correspondents abroad, but they will have the benefit of unprecedented preparations for quick movement to the principal battlefronts and for speedy transmission of their dispatches.

Special airplanes to carry reporters and to ferry their dispatches to the cable-heads probably will be made available and it is expected that one or more big planes will be fitted out as a press headquarters, with facilities for transmission of dispatches if field radio is not available or if an emergency arises.

The facilities for correspondents are being worked out in great detail at United States Army headquarters in England, in coöperation with the British War Office, but final plans naturally must depend upon the Allied plan of campaign against Nazi Europe and upon military developments which cannot be foretold except in broad outline. There has never been a campaign in which correspondents did not have to face and solve many unexpected emergencies and the invasion of Europe certainly will not be an exception, but all of the experience of reporters on battlefronts throughout the world since the war began is being studied and will be used by press officers in the European theater.

The necessity for close coöperation between press officers and newspapermen in advance of an important operation was vividly illustrated

in my own experience in preparing for two important Allied attacks—the raid on Dieppe and the invasion of North Africa.

The Dieppe raid was an example of how not to do it. Only broad-line arrangements were made in advance, upon the insistence of correspondents, for newspapermen to accompany Commando troops occasionally on raids against the European coast. The American Correspondents' Association submitted to the British War Office a list of names drawn by lot and the War Office theoretically selected the men in rotation.

Under this system, men were summoned secretly for a period of training with the Commando troops and assigned to an operation. They might be out of touch with their offices for two or three weeks, after which they would go on a raid or, if the operation was called off for some reason, return to London. Some of these reporters also went on raids about which they have never been permitted to write.

No information was given newspapermen in advance regarding the Dieppe raid, but a limited number of correspondents were told to report secretly for assignment. Combined Operations Headquarters then told the censorship that nothing was to be passed regarding what happened at Dieppe unless it was written by the reporters who accompanied the troops and that their stories were to be pooled and made available to everyone after they returned to London.

This resulted in two days of endless confusion in which a great part of the real story of the operation was held up until the censorship eventually was forced to change its instructions. The secrecy which the Combined Operations Command considered essential also resulted in some wild reports that the raid was a "second front" invasion.

The handling of the North African operation showed considerable improvement. Weeks before the invasion date, the executive committee of the American Correspondents' Association met with a United States general in charge of press relations.

It was pointed out to us that there were naturally going to be one or more operations of importance and that it was intended to make preparations conforming as far as possible to our desires. Suggestions and even detailed plans were solicited from the executive committee and later discussed again with the general at another meeting. As a result, a system was worked out for selection of American correspondents on an equitable basis and in line with the size of the operation contemplated.

From that point on we were in the hands of the armed forces, knowing that the press officers might make decisions that were contrary to those we desired but that these officers understood and sympathized

with our problems. Reporters later were selected from the lists we had submitted and were told to report quietly by twos or threes, prepared for a journey of indefinite length. The North African invasion was such a big operation that an unexpectedly large number of correspondents vanished from London during a single week, a total of five being taken from the United Press bureau alone in addition to a sixth who was assigned the same week as the first American correspondent ever attached to the British home fleet.

American newspapers benefited from the fact that our press relations officers were experienced newspapermen. Colonel Joseph Phillips, former correspondent of the *New York Herald-Tribune* and managing editor of *Newsweek,* was in direct charge of the African invasion correspondents. He later made a hazardous airplane flight from Casablanca to Gibraltar to carry the dispatches of American correspondents who had covered the meeting of President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill, because transmission facilities were inadequate at Casablanca.

Colonel Morrow Krum, once city editor of the *Chicago Tribune,* succeeded Phillips as chief press relations officer at European Headquarters in London and was placed in charge of preparing for the invasion of Europe.

Meanwhile, Major Jack Reading, in charge of press relations for the U. S. Eighth Air Force based in England, had worked out a plan for improving coverage of the steadily increasing air offensive against Nazi Europe. Each American news bureau in London was offered an opportunity to assign one man to the Air Force, which in turn arranged special press facilities at bomber command headquarters. Direct telephone lines were installed to our London offices.

The reporters assigned to the Air Force were required to pass special physical examinations and take brief courses in first aid and in how to handle themselves aboard a bomber in order not to interfere with the crew when on a bombing mission. Their first mission was to Wilhelmshaven and they were "briefed" for it with the regular bomber crews, but as non-combatants. One correspondent, Robert Post, of the *New York Times,* is missing as a result of that raid.

The task of covering the war in the vast European, Mid-Eastern and Russian theaters centers in London and is gradually shaking down into a more closely knit system after a period of disruption and frequently of confusion. For a news agency such as the United Press, London was a central relay point at which the news of most of the world could be brought into focus before the war. After hostilities started, disruption of communications broke each theater of war into

an isolated sector and shifted the main relay center to New York. At present the center is shifting back to some extent to London and will continue to do so as the European war approaches its climax.

Communications facilities can hardly be compared to pre-war transmission, except from London to New York; but the speed of transmission from such news centers as Moscow and Cairo has gradually improved in recent months, and in some centers, such as Algiers, special facilities have been provided for voice transmission of dispatches to London or New York at certain periods.

The importance of such strategic neutral cities as Stockholm, Berne, Istanbul and Madrid is steadily increasing and United Press bureaus in those points are being strengthened to meet the growing task of keeping a close watch on news from enemy territory and of separating Dr. Goebbels' often subtle propaganda from facts which may show the trend inside Germany.

Radio listening posts to keep a twenty-four-hour-a-day check on enemy broadcasts as well as to speed up reception of news from Moscow are becoming of increasing importance. Twenty men and women who are fluent in a dozen languages, and expert stenographers as well, staff the United Press listening post in London, and only priorities on radio equipment limit the size of such posts. They handle a tremendous volume of news traffic each day, including enemy communiques and important speeches, as frequently they are the only immediate source for news such as the scuttling of the French fleet at Toulon.

American news coverage in Britain centers at U. S. European Theater Headquarters, where there are press relations offices of the Army, Air Force, Navy, and Marines. Many of the press officers are former newspapermen, and in general the handling of communiques and similar releases—all of which go through the British Ministry of Information channels—has been worked out efficiently. The American censors also work with the M. O. I., and virtually all dispatches bearing on American operations or activities are referred to them after being passed by the British censor.

A system of direct telephones links the various censors with headquarters, and ordinarily there is surprisingly little delay in preparing dispatches for transmission. The censorship organization, however, is so vast and often so cumbersome that blunders and red tape still can ruin the product of a reporter's typewriter on many occasions.

Barry Faris was born in South Dakota and educated in Missouri. He has been a newspaperman all over the map. He has been vice-president of International News Service since 1927 and its editor-in-chief since 1932. He is a member of the executive council of Sigma Delta Chi.

THE CORRESPONDENTS IN THE PACIFIC

By BARRY FARIS

It has always taken a lot of ability to be a good war correspondent. A man has had to have initiative, enterprise, resourcefulness, and a great deal of discrimination and discretion.

But this war—the way it is being fought and the way it is being covered—has introduced a brand new ingredient so far as newspapermen are concerned. That is personal courage. Enough cannot be said in praise of the men who have left city desks, sports jobs and general assignments in American and European capitals to put on uniforms and take their places in the front lines with the toughest fighting men of the United States Army, Navy, and Air Force.

I know what these writers and correspondents are going through, day in and day out, for I returned not long ago from a 30,000-mile swing through the Pacific fighting zones. The courage and resilience of soldiers, sailors, marines, and fliers I encountered never failed to encourage me and emphasize my confidence in ultimate victory. And the bravery of all correspondents was just as gratifying, for, in a way, that struck even closer home.

OWI Director Elmer Davis went on record officially a few months ago with the disclosure that no single branch of the armed services has suffered so large a proportion of casualties as the correspondents' corps. What he did not say, and what is equally important, is that among these correspondents there is no grumbling, no rushing to take cover, no insistent demand upon the home office for furlough, and no theatrical heroics.

Yet by June, 1943, it was a well known fact that no less than twelve United States correspondents had been killed in action, fifty-five had been wounded or stricken with disease, and twenty-eight had been taken prisoner. It would seem logical that this terrific incidence of casualties among a group that does not total much over five hundred in all would have the effect of discouraging correspondents upon the scene and disheartening other young men who had set their hearts upon the thrilling task of covering this greatest of all world conflicts.

But the opposite is the case. My desk is piled high this moment with applications from all over the country signed by men from the bureaus of International News Service and from outside the organization. Alongside this sizeable pile there is a second one, a formidable sheaf of long, official printed documents in quadruplet which certify that this, that, or the other applicant has been accepted and accredited by the Army for journalistic service overseas. These comprise our present reserve, men who will be subjected to tedious and painful injections for smallpox, typhoid, typhus, tetanus, and other diseases and then sent to the particular war theaters where they are most needed.

My Pacific journey first took me to Pearl Harbor, where the newspaper crowd may best be described as comfortable and dissatisfied. They feel in Hawaii that the war has passed them by, that the Japanese will never dare to come again, and that, so far as war risks are concerned, they might just as well be in Des Moines. But in the South Seas I began to run into the correspondents who have been in the thick of things ever since Tojo pushed his own suicide button on December 7, 1941, and I had a chance to see how they really feel about things.

Richard (Dick) Tregaskis, who eased his six-foot, seven-inch frame into Tulagi harbor with the first group of Marines to land there last September, resolved a lot of my doubts with his first answer to my question as to how he was bearing up under shot and shell. "Everything's okay now," he said. "I took the arm-band off."

Although a change for the better is in the offing, up to now correspondents in battle-zones have been required to wear a green arm brassard with a huge white "C," which ribald and irreligious soldiers have frequently chosen to translate as "Chaplain," and as far worse when they were in the mood. At Guadalcanal, where Tregaskis stuck with the Marines for those first awful six weeks of seemingly hopeless combat without air cover and with a handful of men against a hundred thousand, he found the Japanese shooting purposely at him because of the arm-band. Either they didn't like correspondents, or perhaps they thought the "C" stood for "Consequences," the one

thing our Pacific enemy is finally learning to fear. In any case, Dick obtained permission from his commanding officer to remove the brassard.

"After that," he said, "everything was fine. All I had to do was find a deep enough fox-hole, learn how to live without sleeping, discover a way to deal with mosquitos carrying a six-foot wingspread, doctor up on typhus, malaria, dysentery, and the barber's itch, and everything was swell."

But while every correspondent you meet will have this same smiling sort of story, you know it is something of an act. Those boys take their lives in their hands every minute. Not only in the Pacific, but in Europe as well, they go with the British and American air forces on bombing missions, and on manoeuvres when live ammunition is used. And the risk will multiply itself many times when the real big push—the invasion of Europe—comes, when correspondents will go forward with the vanguard and remain to report for posterity not only the greatest campaign but the greatest victory for democracy against the forces of tyranny that the world has ever known.

My heart was most touched when I canvassed officers and men in the Pacific for details of the death of Jack Singer, a crack young sports reporter from Los Angeles and the *New York Journal-American,* who had asked me for a war assignment.

"I'm through with baseball," he told me, and somehow there was no regret in his voice. "The biggest story in the world is out there in the Pacific. I want to get in on the play."

Singer went out. One of his first assignments was aboard a United States aircraft carrier, and from that "ringside" he filed some of the most dramatic stories to come out of the war. The best one of all was the description of a torpedo plane attack upon a Japanese destroyer. Unbeknown to his New York office, Singer prevailed upon the pilot to take him along on the torpedo plane which sank the enemy ship, and from his typewriter there came a stirring, soul-warming story, action-filled, yet so modest in its construction that it was difficult to find a first person pronoun.

That was early last Fall. On September 22, there came to my office a terse, tragic message from the Navy Department.

"Jack Singer missing in action," it said. "Advise what disposition to make of his belongings."

Many weeks passed before we learned just what had happened. Singer had been out on some hazardous, self-chosen assignment, and had come back to the aircraft carrier *Wasp* to write his dispatches in the ward-room. Enemy reconnaissance spotted the *Wasp* and Japa-

nese submarines attacked. The first torpedo struck squarely, hit just below the ward-room at the waterline, and set the carrier on fire. Jack Singer was never seen again. International News Service has been fortunate in losing only Singer, although eight of our men have been wounded or injured and many others have been laid low by tropical diseases and exposures. George Lait, for example, was wounded in the great German "blitz" on London and later suffered shrapnel wounds in the ankle and thigh when an explosive bomb dropped near him in the Egyptian desert. Three American correspondents already have been decorated by military authorities for courage under fire or wounds in action. Perhaps the most dramatic adventure of a correspondent still alive was that of Vern Haugland, of the Associated Press, who parachuted into the jungle from an Army bomber in a terrific storm over New Guinea and miraculously survived a forty-three-day ordeal of exposure, starvation and fever in making his way to a remote mission station. Haugland was decorated personally by General MacArthur for "devotion to duty and fortitude."

On behalf of the whole corespondents' corps it should be said that "courage and devotion to duty" come to public notice only when some man is killed, wounded or reported missing. The bald truth is that every day and every hour, the newspaper and press association correspondents display a bravery that is heart-warming and a glorious tribute to the profession.

Despite the dangers, despite the hardships, and despite the enforced absences from home, I can still, however, recommend the job of foreign correspondent to any young man who has the intellectual ability for the task and the courage that must go with it.

For the job is nothing more or nothing less than chronicling for future history the day-by-day exploits of the greatest soldier the world has ever known—the doughboy. The task of a war correspondent is to tell how he meets setbacks and surmounts them, encounters superior numbers and defeats them, achieves victory and then goes on to the job that lies ahead. The war correspondent of today considers this reporting of American glory a proud honor and a high privilege. To do it and do it well, he willingly subordinates himself and risks his life and limbs. He knows that the man in action next to him is risking nothing less.

Mr. Morris began his newspaper work on the *St. Joseph News-Press*, afterward working on the *Jefferson City Daily News-Capital*. In 1921 he left Missouri journalism to join the *Japan Advertiser*, of which he eventually became general manager. In 1930 he was made manager of the United Press bureau in Mexico City, and three years later he was in a similar position in Shanghai. As Far Eastern manager of the United Press, he has been in active charge of UP coverage in that area throughout the present war. He was awarded the plaque of the Headliners' Club for outstanding reporting in 1938. This article was received from New Delhi by radio.

COVERING THE WAR AGAINST JAPAN

By JOHN R. MORRIS

The war in the Far East has provided an unparalleled struggle for communications lines on the part of American newspapermen, as well as on that of the Allied forces.

Since the conflict started in China in 1937, war has spread from an "incident" at the Marco Polo Bridge to a vast field of land, sea, and air operations extending ten thousand miles from North China to the shores of Australia and from the Coral Sea to the Bay of Bengal.

For more than five years this was a war of retreat for China, and then for the Allied forces, as the Japanese sought to seize and use all of the vital communications lines of the Orient. For war correspondents struggling to collect and relay to America the story of the retreat, the war sometimes became a personal nightmare in which countless obstacles were overcome only by thorough advance planning and by taking fullest advantage of the breaks when an emergency arose.

Let me take the experiences of the United Press as an example, because those experiences, after all, were my own. When the China war started we were neutrals, hopping back and forth between the Japanese and Chinese lines around Peiping, Tientsin and Shanghai. Our communications problems were not much changed from peace time, but as the greater conflict approached we began to realize some of the difficulties that would have to be faced, and began making our own preparations.

At Shanghai, in those days, we could sit in a roof garden on top

of a big modern hotel in the International Settlement and watch the front-line warfare—see the shells rip into Chapei station, see the Japanese anti-aircraft guns open up on board warships in the harbor. We were outsiders and neutral civilians, but we would not be for long.

But today those correspondents who once covered the battle of Shanghai as they would have covered a great fire or disaster at home are in uniform and attached to American or other Allied forces. They are veterans of long and hazardous treks over the mountains of China, or bitter battles in Bataan, Malaya and New Guinea, of aerial bombardments and sea battles. They are no longer free to roam from one side of the battle line to the other, but they have willingly risked—and sometimes lost—their lives beside the men who are fighting our front line battles.

Throughout the conflict the task for reporters has been fundamentally the same. Coming events must be foreseen. Good men, trained to see and investigate and report, must be on the spot. Communications must be studied and planned to the smallest detail. And above all, the great organization for news distribution must be geared to pick up dispatches from an isolated front line post and speed them into a complicated, far-flung system of world-wide communications so that they may reach the newspaper reader in St. Louis, in Glasgow and in Bombay in the shortest possible time.

That task in the Orient, where a Mongolian pony sometimes is the fastest method of sending messages, is no picnic. Not even when field wireless and airplanes are substituted for the pony. At first the difficulties were the usual ones of peace time. As a result of thorough preparations, the United Press began the war with a beat from Tientsin on the Marco Polo Bridge battle, where our correspondent was in the right place at the right time and able to take advantage of our specially organized communications in China. At Shanghai, dispatches could be filed by normal routes from the very edge of the battlefield. Even when the United States was attacked by Japan, the United Press was able for a time to continue operating special communications facilities from Manila and other centers at a great saving in time of transmission.

But some of the best stories of the war got into the headlines only because reporters overcame tremendous difficulties. Harold Guard, U. P. bureau manager at Singapore, provided one of the brilliant reportorial highlights of the war by a series of trips to the front lines in Malaya, where he shared the dangers and hardships of Australians fighting a losing battle in the jungle. Most of Guard's dispatches had to be sent back by courier to the telegraph head or even carried to

Singapore. Sometimes returning officers would carry his copy, and sometimes he had to return to Singapore to write and file his stories; but throughout the Malayan fighting he gave the world a remarkable series of exclusive dispatches disclosing for the first time the methods of jungle warfare practiced by the Japanese and what we would have to do to lick them.

Guard left Singapore only after communications with the outside were broken and reached Java, where he covered the Japanese attack on that island and escaped in a Flying Fortress to Australia. Recently, still at the front, he saw American and Allied troops put into practice in New Guinea the methods that did lick the enemy despite his skill in jungle fighting.

Guard's brilliant reporting, including one of the first trips made by an American reporter on an actual bombing mission, has been but one example of what newspapermen are doing in the scattered war theatres of the Pacific.

The battle of Java, for instance, was covered under great difficulties despite the efficient Dutch communications system. When I reached Java as the Japanese moved down on Singapore, we were able to use Dutch wireless communications from both Batavia and Soerbaja naval station. But as the enemy advanced, these routes became so crowded that transmission to New York or London often required twenty-four hours or more. To overcome this delay, we resorted to regular telephone calls to New York after arranging for the call to go through at a time when we expected to have the day's communique available. These calls frequently lasted half an hour or an hour because of the heavy volume of news, which was dictated at great speed and recorded in our New York office.

The battle of Java also cost us one of our best correspondents, William MacDougall, who returned to headquarters at Bandoeng after he had been told to leave for Australia while transportation was still available. MacDougall stayed on the job while the enemy was fighting his way into the mountains and at the last moment tried to get away by ship from the south coast. He is still missing.

Meanwhile, Frank Hewlett, in charge of the United Press bureau at Manila, and half a dozen staff members were covering the various fronts in the Philippines until MacArthur fell back on Bataan, where Hewlett lived with front line troops until just before the fall of Corregidor. Hewlett had taken a radio operator and a small sending set to Bataan in hope of transmitting dispatches direct to our own receiving stations in Honolulu or Singapore, but power for the trans-

mitter was never available. Dispatches were cleared through the Army and Navy and were usually delayed at least a day.

Hewlett eventually escaped southward and rejoined MacArthur's headquarters in Australia, after remaining on Bataan longer than any other American correspondent.

Darrell Berrigan and Robert P. Martin, however, had the greatest physical difficulties in getting their stories to the world. Berrigan was in Bangkok when the war began, and he had to make his way overland to Burma, often travelling by jungle road and elephant path, in order to send out the first description of the enemy entry into the capital of Siam. He then covered the first phase of the fighting in Burma and when forced to leave Rangoon, joined Stilwell's headquarters in the interior, covering some of the most bitter fighting of the war until Burma fell. He made another long and hazardous journey by jeep to India, where he has since been stationed at New Delhi; but he did have one pleasant journey later. He rode in a flying fortress on December 27th on one of the longest bombing raids on record. And for Berrigan it was a sweet revenge when he saw our bombs smashing the Japanese in Bangkok harbor.

Martin, in charge of our Shanghai bureau, had been planning for six months against the day when the Japanese would seize the city. When that day came, he and MacDougall (who was in China before being shifted to Java) sent dispatches over the Shanghai radio station until it was actually seized by the enemy. Then they endured internment only until December 26, when Martin's plans began to materialize. Chinese whom Martin had engaged in advance guided them out of Shanghai and into the hands of a guerilla band, who started them on a long, arduous overland trail toward Chungking. There—long after the events had occurred—they were able to tell for the first time the eye-witness story of Japanese occupation of Shanghai. Martin, too, has had an opportunity to pay his respects to the Japanese in China from the nose of an American bomber, having made several trips to occupied areas with our bombing squadrons.

Robert Bellaire, who had been a correspondent in China for four years, took on the toughest U. P. assignment when he became manager in Tokyo in the summer of 1941. Day by day, he watched the war come closer, and his long dispatches reported the trend accurately and objectively, despite the many restrictions imposed by the Japanese. Often Bellaire was forced to send his information to Shanghai for transmission because the Japanese already were treating American correspondents as spies. Bellaire's assignment in many respects was more harrowing than any other because there was no assurance that

the Japanese would agree to exchange correspondents after war started and most of them were imprisoned until exchange arrangements were made.

Communications facilities have been gradually improved in Australia after an early period of tremendous strain; but in India the problem of transmitting news has continued to be difficult, because of limited land lines and vastly increased war traffic. Correspondents on the eastern front have repeatedly faced great dangers in accompanying Allied troops back into Burma, and have had only the most primitive communications facilities. Walter Briggs, of the U. P. bureau at Calcutta, was recently wounded in the thigh on the Burma front.

During the last six years of fighting in the Orient, the United Press correspondents have learned much of the technique of retreat. Our Chinese capital bureau was moved from Nanking to Hankow and thence to Chungking. Far Eastern Headquarters were moved from Shanghai to Manila to Batavia and finally to New Delhi. Key bureaus have been closed by Japanese occupation and transmission facilities that were the result of years of experimentation and investigation were lost almost overnight.

But now we're beginning to learn still another lesson. We are getting to cover the same ground again, but this time in the opposite direction.

The author of this article, generally regarded as a martyr to the free press in China, is now making a slow but satisfactory recovery from physical injuries suffered while a prisoner of the Japanese following the fall of Shanghai. Mr. Powell was born in Missouri and was a member of the first class to be graduated from an organized School of Journalism—Missouri '10. After several years of newspaper work he taught in the Missouri School four years, and then became managing editor of the *China Weekly Review*. He has covered all the Chinese wars and important international conferences of the past twenty-five years.

PUBLISHING IN SHANGHAI

By JOHN B. POWELL

When the war struck Shanghai on the early morning of December 7, 1941, the city had four English-language dailies, a half dozen Chinese dailies, a French (pro-Vichy) daily, a Russian (anti-Soviet) daily, organ of the emigree White Russian community, and two German papers, one pro-Nazi and the other anti-Nazi. The Japanese also published two Japanese-language papers in Shanghai, one of which was the organ of the Army and the other of the Navy. The anti-Hitler paper had been started by refugee German and Austrian Jews, some twenty-five thousand having arrived in the city since the advent of Nazism in Germany. Of the English-language press, the *North-China Daily News,* oldest paper in Shanghai, was owned by British interests. The second oldest paper, *The China Press,* was owned by Chinese-American interests. The third paper, the *Shanghai Times,* was owned by British interests, but subsidized by the Japanese. The fourth paper, the *Shanghai Evening Post and Mercury,* was owned by C. V. Starr, an American insurance man who resided in New York.

Aside from the English-language dailies, Shanghai was also the publishing center for a large number of periodicals, of which the American-owned *China Weekly Review* was the oldest and most influential. The *Far Eastern Review,* an engineering journal originally started by an American, had been taken over by Japanese interests. Another magazine published by an American, *The China Digest,* also followed a pro-Japanese policy. A fortnightly, known as the *People's Tribune,* was published by Chinese interests affiliated with the puppet

government of Wang Ching-wei. In addition there were two or three other English-language magazines published by Chinese interests which were of literary or political nature. The magazines were issued from the presses of a half-dozen large printing plants owned by foreign or Chinese interests. The Commercial Press, largest printing concern in China, which was owned by Chinese interests, published several Chinese-language magazines, of which one, *Social Welfare,* had an extensive national circulation. Shanghai was also the publishing center for several magazines devoted to Christian missionary activities, of which *The Chinese Recorder* was the oldest and best known.

There also were published in Shanghai a large number of small vernacular papers, most of them political in nature, popularly known as the "mosquito press," of which several had extensive circulation. They were all printed in tabloid size and in simple language to appeal to the masses.

Since the Japanese troops did not cross the borders of the International Settlement until about four o'clock on the morning of December 7, all of the daily papers had issued and circulated their Sunday morning editions to subscribers and news-stands. Although the war between China and Japan had been in progress since 1937, the International Settlement, wherein most of the newspapers and magazines were published, had escaped involvement directly. The population of Shanghai, prior to Pearl Harbor, numbered probably 3,500,000, of which some 75,000 or 80,000 were Americans and Europeans. The Japanese attack on the American and British gunboats in Shanghai and the subsequent occupation of the city was as much a surprise to the people of the city as was the attack on Pearl Harbor to the people of Honolulu.

Since the Shanghai Sunday morning papers had already been distributed before the Japanese attack, the subscribers found nothing in their papers to apprise them of what had happened. Those Sunday morning issues, the last to be printed in Shanghai under normal conditions, will be examined with much curiosity in the future because they marked the end of free journalism in the Far East.

Established exactly a century ago, the International Settlement had always been under the control of Britons and Americans and the Anglo-Saxon conception of a free press had always prevailed in it, even in periods of extreme crises. The traditional freedom of the press in Shanghai was largely responsible for the fact that this city had become the chief publishing center on the continent of Asia. Attempts had been made on many occasions to enforce regulations designed to establish police censorship over the press, but none had succeeded. One

such attempt in 1925, inspired by Japanese interests, to give the police power to censor newspapers was introduced at the annual meeting of voters, but it was rejected by a large majority.

Since the press in Japan had always been controlled by the government and newspapers were subject to police censorship, the Japanese were always resentful of the absence of such regulations in Shanghai. Their resentment was shown in 1932, on the first occasion of Japanese military intervention at Shanghai, when the Japanese concentrated their artillery fire and air-bombs on the extensive works of the Commercial Press. This concern published magazines, books, and school texts which were largely responsible for the development of Chinese nationalism. When the Japanese finished their work of destruction, not a single building of the printing works was left standing. The proprietors managed to save some of their equipment by carting it from the native Chapei area, where the plant was located, into the International Settlement; but the loss was tremendous, financially to the Chinese proprietors and culturally to the nation.

What the Japanese did to the Commercial Press at Shanghai was similar in some respects to what Hitler did to the famous *Ullstein Press* in Berlin, which had flourished under the republican governments in Germany which followed World War I. There was a difference, however, in method: the Japanese destroyed the *Commercial Press* completely; Hitler stole the *Ullstein Press* and diverted its publications to his political purposes.

With the start the Japanese made in their original military intervention at Shanghai in 1932, it was natural that they should concentrate their attention on the newspapers of the city when they invaded the International Settlement, following Pearl Harbor. By nine o'clock that morning squads of Japanese soldiers or marines were stationed at every newspaper office in the city, and publishers who rushed downtown after learning of the Japanese occupation were unable to enter their offices.

Japanese action against the press took two forms: imprisonment and execution of editors, and bribery and intimidation of newspaper proprietors. Two outstanding English-language newspapers in Shanghai, the British-owned *North China Daily News* and the Chinese-American owned *China Press* were sealed and the editors imprisoned. The two other dailies, *The Shanghai Evening Post and Mercury,* American-owned, and the British-owned *Shanghai Times* were taken over and continued in publication as Japanese organs. What private arrangements the Japanese made with the American and British managers was not announced, but neither of the papers missed an

issue and both are still being published. But there was a world of difference in the material published in the issues following the Japanese occupation. In place of dispatches from world centers by United Press and Reuters, there were dispatches by Japanese Domei, German Transocean and D.N.B. (*Deutches Nachrichten Bureau*). Both of the papers on the following day contained eight-column heads telling of the *total* destruction of the United States Fleet at Pearl Harbor!

In the case of the Chinese papers, all were closed and sealed and the editors imprisoned, except a few who managed to escape from the city. Later the Japanese attempted to revive one of the papers with an imitation edition which they called the *New Shun Pao* in place of the *Shun Pao* which had been one of the leading papers of the country. The publishers of another paper, the *Ta Kung Pao*, had previously moved the plant to Chungking, where the paper is still being printed—in a cave, to escape air-bombing.

While the Japanese did not intervene, militarily, in the International Settlement until Pearl Harbor, they had tried repeatedly, following their invasion of China proper in 1937, to intimidate the editors of the English-language and Chinese-language press. Their moves against the English-language papers took the form of seizure of copies in the mail, which they were able to accomplish through their control of the Chinese post office. However, the publishers were able to circumvent this to a large extent by sending their papers through ports which the Japanese had not yet occupied, by means of neutral steamers. Also the native Chinese staff in the post office would often secrete the papers from the eyes of the Japanese inspectors.

The editors of the Chinese newspapers, however, had a much more difficult time. Several were kidnapped from the Settlement and were never heard of again. In two or three cases the victims were decapitated and their heads thrown into Settlement streets with tags attached warning other editors against opposing the Japanese. In other cases the editors were confined in the notorious Bridge House internment camp and starved to death or permitted to die of disease in the filthy vermin-infested cells. The Japanese military authorities and the puppet Nanking Government which they controlled, also circulated so-called "black-lists" containing the names of American, British and Chinese editors who were threatened with deportation or assassination. A hand-grenade was thrown at the writer, but it failed to explode, and a shot was fired at Carroll Alcott, news commentator on the staff of the *China Press*, but it also failed to find its intended mark.

Losses suffered by newspapers and publishing houses of Shanghai are enormous. Three of the papers, the century-old *North-China*

Daily News, and the Chinese-owned *Shun Pao* and *Sin Wan Pao* owned their buildings and had modern plants. Printers, press-men and office employees thrown out of work probaby exceeded a thousand for the foreign papers alone; the number on the Chinese papers and printing plants was vastly larger. Paper stocks which the Japanese seized in Shanghai also amounted to a large figure, and to them must be added the extensive electrotyping, stereotyping, plate-making and type-casting industries, which were well developed in Shanghai. The large American and British printing press and equipment concerns maintaining offices and stocks in Shanghai also suffered heavy losses. This was particularly true of Mergenthaler's British branch, which had large stocks of linotypes and parts in Shanghai.

It is presumed that steps will be taken by the Allies to compel Japan to pay for the losses that her occupation of Shanghai occasioned, but that cannot be done until the end of the war. In the meantime the publishers must bear the loss.

Americans have been concerned with journalism and the printing industry in China since our original contact with that country in the clipper-ship days of the first half of the past century. W. W. Wood, a Philadelphian, established the *Canton Register,* the first American paper, in 1827. The most ambitious project, however, was started in 1832, when Elijah Coleman Bridgmen launched the *Chinese Repository,* a monthly magazine which continued for more than a quarter of a century and was succeeded by the *Chinese Recorder,* which was under the editorship of American missionaries up to Pearl Harbor. The *Chinese Repository* was financed by "that pious and generous merchant from New York, Mr. David W. Olyphant," and the object of the paper, as set down on the masthead was, "To give the most authentic and valuable information respectively to China and the adjacent countries." Once a well-known British diplomat complimented the editor of the paper by saying it was "as good as if it had been published in London."

Since those early days American newspapermen and publishers have played a prominent and generally honorable part in the journalism of Asia, whether in China, the Philippines, or even in Japan. They, along with the British, have carried the torch of a free press to countries where there previously was little conception of this important foundation stone of democracy. Let us hope that steps will be taken to insure the maintenance of a free press in post-war planning for countries now under Fascist dictatorships. There is no place in the world where a free press is more greatly needed than in the Far East.

An alumnus of the Missouri School of Journalism, Mr. Turner's first job was on the *Japan Advertiser*, which for some years annually took one or two of Missouri's most brilliant graduates. He began working for the United Press in Tokyo, and later that organization gave him assignments in New York, Washington, Kansas City, Mexico City, and London. Since 1935 he has been business manager of NEA Service.

PHOTOGRAPHERS IN UNIFORM

By RALPH H. TURNER

When the United States entered the present war, American journalism faced a tremendous job of world-wide picture reporting. It was a new problem, a new challenge. It presented an assignment which was unexplored by past experience.

This wasn't a conveniently concentrated war. Action wasn't limited to a Western Front which a few official photographers could handle, as in 1917-18. It wasn't a war which a resourceful cameraman could cover on a bicycle as Jimmy Hare covered the Russo-Japanese fight. It was a war on five continents, on the seven seas, on a dozen different fronts. It posed entirely new problems of manpower, expense, transport, and communication. The logistics of global photography were terrifying. The job of toting and preserving chemicals to develop and print pictures under climatic conditions ranging from the sub-zero Arctic to tropical jungles was in itself something to confound any photo editor.

Interest in pictures reached a new high among U. S. readers when the war broke. For the first time in any war, pictures were transmitted across the continent by wire, across the oceans by radio. In the offing was the prospect of a machine that could send pictures over the air waves direct from a war front to the United States.

The folks back home demanded pictures—pictures from everywhere. The newspapers must get them. How?

The responsibility for doing the job fell primarily upon the three American picture-gathering agencies, the Associated Press, Acme

Newspictures, and International News Photos. *Life* magazine had an equal stake in the task at hand. So did the Army and Navy, which realized the importance of publicizing their war activities and of keeping the vast picture enterprise within the bounds of military discretion.

From this background came the most expansive news photo undertaking in the history of journalism.

This, then, is the story of the Wartime Photographic Pool, an essentially democratic, peculiarly American institution now known among picture men as "The Pool."

On the Sunday that bombs fell on Pearl Harbor, news picture editors rushed into their offices with a job ahead that staggered the imagination. American soldiers and sailors would be flung across the face of the globe. Wherever they went, there would be pictures to cover. Photographers must be on their way—now! Each of the agencies began its own huddles with the Army and Navy. You don't just call a taxi and start a cameraman to the South Pacific, in the manner of covering a four-alarm fire. You ask the Army or the Navy about credentials, transportation, and a thousand other things.

The agencies at that time already had their own men in such centers as London and Honolulu. Each could add to its staff hither and yon. That meant untold expense, depletion of manpower, duplication of effort. It was uncertain whether Washington brass-hats would permit it, anyway. In the last war, the armed services' own photographers had made virtually all frontline action pictures. Agencies and newspapers were not permitted to send staff men into combat zones, but were confined mostly to the safety of army camps and training centers.

It was possible, in this war, that the Army and Navy might attempt to do their own picture-taking; that they might not want competitive photographers vying for facilities, crowding the censorship, and otherwise cluttering up the scene. The picture agencies thought it important that their own experts do the camera work. They anticipated a better product, and they wanted pictures uninfluenced by an official point of view.

As it happened, neither the Army nor Navy had the manpower or equipment to cover a world-wide picture story. The Navy, especially, recognized that, realizing how far-flung its activities were going to be. In the middle of December, right after Pearl Harbor, the Public Relations Department of the Navy asked Acme, AP, International, and *Life* to enter a coöperative arrangement. The Navy did not attempt to prescribe the formula but left it to the four organizations

to set up their own rules and regulations, subject to official approval. These were drafted, submitted, and accepted.

The Army learned of the organization and asked that it embrace land warfare, too. A similar agreement was accepted by the Army's public relations department. Both agreements were signed by representatives of the four pool members.

Thus was created the Photographic War Pool. The agreements were signed in late January, 1942. They provided that the three agencies and *Life* pool their resources, supply photographers for the war fronts from the staffs of all four organizations and make their pictures available to all four participants. The first Pool photographer left on assignment on January 14.

Here was something new, something significant in American journalism.

American newspapers had been assured a complete, professional pictorial document of U. S. participation in the greatest war of all time, in whatever distant sea, land, or sky Americans saw action. Through the three agencies and the various services they supply, the combined picture product was made available to all the daily and weekly newspapers of the country.

Through the intelligent coöperation of the Army and Navy, the enterprise, experience, and objective judgment of the trained news photographer had been preserved, subject only to military considerations. One of the free traditions of American newspapers had been maintained at a time when governments everywhere were assuming such functions.

In April, 1943, twenty-eight Pool photographers were on assignment, in every part of the United Nations world where war is being fought. The four Pool members were spending approximately four hundred thousand dollars a year for war pictures. Pool photographers, who a year ago were snapping their shutters in New York, Washington, Chicago, or San Francisco, had scrambled ashore with their cameras in Guadalcanal and Algeria. The newspaper editor back home, scarcely less than the reader, had taken for granted the varied portrayal of the ubiquitous American soldier, whether the local background was palm tree or Nissen hut.

By the use of special telephoto equipment, the Army Signal Corps now is transmitting Pool pictures by wire and wireless direct from North Africa to the United States. This device, developed for the Army by L. A. Thompson, chief engineer for Acme, sends a picture signal over both land wire and radio channels. One of the technical

achievements of the war, it can deliver a picture from Africa to the United States in seven minutes.

In undertaking still pictures specifically, the Pool left the news reels to their own devices. Full-time photographers, already under foreign assignment by the four participants, constituted the nucleus of the Pool. The organization with the smallest number of men in foreign service supplied additional manpower as the Army or Navy made new assignments available. After each organization had supplied two men, others were supplied in rotation. The number of photographers in each theatre of operations was subject to mutual agreement.

Each Pool member agreed to pay the salary and expenses of its own representative. This cost includes food, equipment, insurance, and various miscellany. The Army or Navy transports the men without cost. In the field, billets are free when available, and the men pay the regular officers' mess fee. In permanent encampments such as the U. S. has established in Ireland and Australia the photographers must live at their own expense in hotels or wherever lodgings can be obtained.

The agreement permitted the admission of new members, provided they met the accrediting standards of the War or Navy Departments and complied with the terms of the Pool agreement. Thus, any new member would have to enroll the same number of photographers as each existing member maintained.

The members agreed that "none of them will make promotional claims in their own interest in connection with their own representatives' performance." Interpretation of that clause has been subject to some disagreement. Distribution of all pictures was to be (and is) on an immediate simultaneous basis whenever release is made by the Army or Navy. The organization whose photographer takes the pictures makes a set of prints or copy negatives for the other Pool associates.

Subsequently, in clarifying amendments, the group agreed to mutual consultation before making new assignments of photographers. They also deferred to *Life's* request that pictures from its representatives be held occasionally for simultaneous release in the magazine. This applied specifically to "non-spot," feature material, with the Pool having the right to appraise the work of *Life* photographers before the magazine made its own selections.

That is the bare framework; but behind the halftone which appears so simply on Page 1, out of the Solomons or North Africa, is a story of infinite pains and organization, frequently of hardship and danger.

Pictures of America's first offensive action were taken by Sherman

Montrose, an Acme photographer. Loaded with a full pack, two cameras, plate holders, filters, cans of developer, and hypo, "Monty" went over the side of a transport, down the rope ladders, and up the beach with the Marines at Guadalcanal. He was bombed and shelled with the rest of the invaders, suffered malaria, dysentery, and a badly infected leg, but finally got out to a South Pacific base with more than one hundred pictures. Starting these on their way to the States, he flew back to the Solomons for more.

Frank Prist, another Acme man, trudged with the Americans and British up from Port Moresby across the mountains and jungles to the sea at Buna. It was a hard trek for a man who had been covering the movie beat in Los Angeles, but Prist stood up under it, even to stripping off his clothes and diving through mangrove beds at a river mouth to retrieve his camera. The natives, who had refused to dive for it, told him afterward that the river was full of crocodiles.

Edward Widdis, of the AP, who went to Australia with the first contingent of American troops, spent forty-three days on the Buna-Gona front. In the course of covering the capture of Gona, he contracted malaria. After a period of hospitalization he is now back on the job in Australia.

Jack Rice, also of the AP, traveled over 200,000 miles with Pacific task forces and covered the raid on the Marshall and Gilbert Islands and the battles of Midway and Santa Cruz.

Sam Goldstein, of International, one of four Pool cameramen who landed with the Americans in North Africa, went to work sooner than he had planned, when the ship carrying him from England was torpedoed. He took pictures of the sinking, the transfer of troops to other ships, and their safe arrival in Africa.

Another Pool photographer, David Scherman of *Life,* was on the Egyptian liner *ZamZam* when the Germans torpedoed it. The Germans picked him up, he snapped a picture of the sinking liner, and smuggled it past his guards in a toothpaste tube.

They are on the move all the time, these Pool photographers, as replacements are sent in or new assignments develop. Robert Landry, of *Life,* has traveled 22,000 miles and was enroute to Arabia when this was written. Robert Lee Bryant, of International, has followed an itinerary that has led him to Pearl Harbor, Australia, Persia, Cairo, India, and Chungking.

In April the Pool photographers were scattered as follows: North Africa, 5; Alaska, 1; Australia, 3; with the Pacific Fleet, 4; South Pacific, 1; China, 2; India, 2; London, 3; Atlantic Fleet, 2; Arabia,

1; Panama, 1. In addition, an editor was stationed permanently in Honolulu, and two men were in transit.

Considering the magnitude of the job and the room for complications, the Pool operation has been efficient and satisfactory. It is difficult to suggest a better method. The retention of private enterprise, in coöperation with the government, certainly has been more suited to American newspaper standards than the system followed in foreign countries, where the armed forces themselves, or official propaganda agencies, perform the whole function of picture gathering and distribution. Under that system, pictures are reduced pretty much to official handouts.

There is censorship, of course, under the American Pool set-up, but it has been as liberal as any censorship can be. Pictures generally are censored at the source by staffs under the sectional Army or Navy commander. General MacArthur's censors, for example, scrutinize pictures of Pool photographers in Australia. General Eisenhower's staff looks over the pictures in North Africa. Pictures made in the Pacific, outside the Army area, go to Pearl Harbor for inspection by Admiral Nimitz's office.

Then, the pictures generally are relayed to Washington for another look-see by the War or Navy Departments. On the whole, the dispatch to the U. S. has been reasonably prompt, by plane when possible. The bottleneck is in Washington, where the censors may hold the pictures longer than the Pool thinks necessary while determining what to release. Some pictures are never released. Bob Dorman, general manager of Acme, was shown a file cabinet drawer in a Washington office jammed with negatives and captions from his photographers. He was told they were being held for the duration, and would be given to him after the war.

When and if they are approved in Washington, the negatives and one print of each, sometimes with deletions, are delivered to the Pool member which originated them, for distribution to the other members. The three agencies use their own judgment in selecting the pictures they include in their services to newspapers.

The Pool photographers have enjoyed reasonable freedom of action. They have respected this freedom and have done an excellent professional job, marred only by the action of one photographer in attaching misleading captions to pictures taken in Tunisia.

On the whole, this unique Pool experiment in world-wide war photography has paid a fine tribute to the skill of the American cameraman, the enterprise of his employer, the traditions of the American press, and the good sense of the Army and Navy.

HEMISPHERE SOLIDARITY

Immediately after his graduation from the Missouri School of Journalism in 1930, Mr. Copeland found employment with the United Press, and has been with it ever since. His assignments have taken him to Oklahoma City, Fort Worth, New York, and Buenos Aires. Since 1937, he has been the general South American news manager of United Press.

LATIN AMERICAN JOURNALISM

By W. W. COPELAND

The present war brought to South American journalism the biggest story of its history and with it the biggest problems—not only obstacles in news gathering and presentation, but also a life and death struggle for the continued physical existence of the newspapers themselves. It caused a virtual revolution in journalistic methods but at the same time lifted, to heights never before equalled south of the equator, the ideal of impartial news reporting.

The German invasion of Poland found South American newspapers and the U. S. news agencies, chief sources of news to the southern continent, prepared. Editors and readers had followed developments in Europe step by step and in complete detail from the invasion of Ethiopia, the Spanish civil war, and the formation of the Axis, right up to the threshold of the war. The average South American probably knew better than the average man in the United States what was coming in Europe. His interests were primarily in Europe, because of recent ancestry, and he followed the march of events closely.

With the outbreak of war, big newspapers such as *La Prensa* and *La Nacion* of Buenos Aires, accustomed to publishing three or four pages of foreign news daily, stepped up publication to five or six pages of war and international news, presenting some forty to fifty thousand words a day of foreign matter.

The dailies demanded full and impartial accounts of every phase of the war, whether on the battleground or in the corridors of the

Wilhelmstrasse or Whitehall. News agencies faced the double task of providing a tremendous volume of news and of sifting the propaganda from the huge mass of copy, leaving a residue of factual reporting.

The U. S. news agencies met the challenge admirably and efficiently. The South American public was undoubtedly one of the best, if not the best informed, on developments in Europe as well as in the world in general. South American editors demanded the best coverage because any attempts to pull the wool over the eyes of their readers would spell doom to responsible papers.

Mistrust of official news agencies, whose "news" reports were filled with propaganda and were aimed to convert rather than to inform, reached its peak at the start of the war. The German and Italian agencies, Transocean and Stefani, had left nothing undone in their efforts to scatter their services all over South America. They used bribes, offered free service, and resorted to pressure by diplomatic influence to get their service into newspapers. Axis advertisers used their accounts to squeeze papers. Havas, the French agency, had become largely discredited by the big independent papers because of its official connections.

For years before September 1, 1939, ever since the first world war, U. S. agencies had provided South American readers with full, unbiased, and objective accounts of all events in the world, giving facts and letting the chips fall where they might. The entrance of the U. S. agencies into the South American field had begun during the first world war when the big papers, distrustful of distorted Havas reports, had turned to the United Press and the Associated Press for factual war accounts.

The United Press had begun the sale of world news to the newspapers of Latin America in 1916, more than two years prior to an attempt by any other U. S. news agency to operate in that field, which theretofore had been monopolized by the Havas Agency.

At the start of the second world war, the U. S. agencies served every important newspaper in South America. Havas supplied a large number of papers, usually as an auxiliary service, with a mixture of straightforward news and large amount of propaganda. Neither Transocean nor Stefani, although making tremendous efforts and working in conjunction with their respective Embassies, had been able to make much headway when the war broke. In some countries, particularly Brazil, Transocean served a sprinkling of minor papers.

The fall of France eliminated Havas as a news agency in South America. For a time the Germans managed to keep it alive, using it,

under its old name, as a propaganda vehicle. The subterfuge did not work long. With the demise of Havas, the British agency, Reuters, moved into the field and replaced Havas in many papers, although it scarcely had operated in South America previously.

The fate of Transocean and Stefani was sealed at the Third Consultative Conference of Foreign Ministers in Rio de Janeiro in January, 1940, when that body adopted a resolution recommending that all American countries sever diplomatic relations and communication with Axis powers. Both agencies were banned by government order in every country which broke relations with the Axis and were thus virtually wiped out of South America. The few papers which they continued to serve were notoriously pro-Axis or Axis-financed. No important newspaper whatever continued to print their dispatches.

The impartiality and the efficiency of the U. S. news agencies, with their long service in unmolested handling of news, had tremendous influence not only in producing respect for themselves and the U. S. press but also in fostering a profound regard for democratic principles of government as practiced by us.

Perhaps no trait of American democracy stood out so clearly as the liberal treatment of the U. S. censorship on news coming to South America. Because of disruption of communications with other parts of the world, the South American countries were dependent on their news reaching them through us. Axis sympathizers seized on this to spread word that news coming to South America was being "watered" in the U. S. That was obviously sheer propaganda. Military information of value to the enemy was suppressed by censorship. That was to be expected and it was understood by the publishers. But political censorship was never exercised, a factor which added immeasurable prestige to the U. S. government and to U. S. newspaper principles. This made a profound impression on publishers and public alike. Most publishers throughout South America were familiar with the censorship practices of Europe, and many of them were combating, within their own countries, a tendency of the government in power to try to keep from print all news contrary to the government's interest.

The right to continue factual, objective reporting was not easy to preserve and the agencies had to fight for that right. Pressure groups and well-meaning but uninformed individuals in the American colonies in several countries tried to influence the news agencies to exercise self-censorship, and some tried to convince government officials in Washington that certain types of news should be prohibited. For several months after Pearl Harbor and during the long series of Axis

triumphs in Europe there was strong agitation by some Americans to induce or *force* the United Press and the Associated Press to stop sending news of Axis triumphs to South American newspapers and to suppress Axis communiques altogether. They argued that it was playing the Axis "game," emphasizing their victories, and spreading their propaganda. A common expression was: "This news is all right for the public in England and the United States, where it is understood, but it should never be brought to South America."

A few members of the U. S. diplomatic corps held similar opinions, and the question even reached Washington. The agencies argued that these groups did not understand the reading habits of the people in South America nor how they were influenced. It was true that some few publishers, favoring the Axis, regularly played up these communiques. The agencies contended, however, that to suppress Axis communiques would create suspicion of all other news carried by them and that it would breed mistrust of every act of the U. S. government. The agencies, backed by sound-thinking persons in Washington, blocked this type of censorship. They maintained that publishing Axis communiques when the war was running against the democracies would strengthen the value of the United Nations communiques when the tide began to run the other way. They maintianed that factual reporting was the best propaganda for the United Nations. Subsequent events proved them correct.

While news agencies went through a hard struggle in news gathering to maintain factual news coverage, the newspapers in South America engaged in a severe fight to keep alive physically—because of the reduced supply of newsprint.

Papers had to meet the emergency with every device possible. They radically changed their presentation and news methods. Some papers were converted into tabloids, some disappeared entirely, but most of them managed to keep alive. All streamlined their publications. Some saved space by employing smaller type, both body and headline. *La Prensa* and *La Nacion* of Buenos Aires, which once had published thirty-five to forty-five columns daily of international news, dropped to ten and fourteen columns.

Papers everywhere reduced the number of pages by fifty percent or more. Leading national papers, such as *Correio de Manha* of Rio de Janeiro, dwindled to eight, ten, and twelve pages. *La Prensa* and *La Nacion* curtailed their editions to sixteen and eighteen pages, from an average of forty. Afternoon papers in Rio de Janeiro and Buenos Aires, accustomed to publishing three editions daily, cut to two, simultaneously lessening the number of pages. Extra editions were at a

premium and in some cities papers agreed among themselves not to publish extras.

All departments were compressed and many departments disappeared entirely. Those dropped were generally features such as bridge, cross-word puzzles, comic sections, rotogravure, and literary supplements. Sport sections were cut in half and in some cases eliminated. Even financial and shipping sections, once highly prized, and the society section, so important to South American life, suffered similar fates.

Newspapers in general were forced to limit the amount of advertising, sometimes refusing ads for lack of space. *La Prensa* of Buenos Aires cut its famed classified section from eight or ten pages to three or four. In some cases, owners of large papers, who believed their duty was to the public as a whole and not to the few, made it a rule not to accept double-page ads. They maintained that these crowded out smaller ads and that since their papers are public institutions, space should be prorated among advertisers. The big metropolitan dailies were forced to restrict circulation at a time when reader interest was highest and when new records would have been easy to obtain.

Despite restricted space, however, the bigger papers managed to give their readers a composite picture of what was going on in a world at war. They were able to do so through careful editing, expert selection of news, and improved methods of news handling. Space was reserved for the big stories through careful condensation and streamlining. American methods of "leads" and "pickups" were adopted for the first time. Make-up methods were revolutionized.

One of the biggest stories of the war has been the Russian campaign. From the first day, editors seemed to grasp the idea that this would be the adventure on which Hitler's fate would depend. They called for ample coverage. Russia became the daily banner-line, pushed momentarily from that coveted position only by such big stories as the attack on Pearl Harbor, German occupation of Vichy-France, the invasion of North Africa, the Casablanca Conference and a half-dozen other major "breaks."

Mr. Jamieson was born in New Jersey and most of his newspaper work has been done in that state and in New York City. He received the Pulitzer prize for reporting in 1933 for his work in covering the Lindbergh kidnapping case for the Associated Press. At present he is Director of the Press Division of the Office of Coördinator of Inter-American Affairs.

GOOD NEIGHBOR PROMOTION

By FRANCIS A. JAMIESON

The President's executive order of August 16, 1940, which laid the basis for the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, gave it, among other duties, the responsibility for setting up programs "which, by effective use of governmental and private facilities, in such fields as the arts and sciences, education and travel, the radio, the press, and the cinema, will further the national defense and strengthen the bonds between the nations of the Western Hemisphere."

The basic information policy of the agency was stated quite clearly by Coördinator Nelson Rockefeller when he said: "The countries of this hemisphere are composed of free people, and free people can and will find the right answers for their defense and salvation—whatever the challenge—if they are given the facts and an opportunity truthfully to understand and appreciate their mutual interests."

In order to present the problems of putting this program into action, let me review the situation which existed in 1940. As any traveler can testify, the amount of news from the United States which appeared in even the largest papers south of the Rio Grande was very small. And the stories were of a kind which were not particularly helpful in bettering hemisphere relations. This is in no sense a reflection on Latin American journalism or on the excellent service rendered by the U. S. press associations to two hundred and fifty of the principal newspapers in the other American republics.

Until recently, the main currents of reader interest, as in trade and cultural contacts, ran from East to West and back again, rather

than from North to South. Most international news originated in Europe or in the Orient, not in Washington or New York. The problem which faced the Office of the Coördinator was to increase the amount of news flowing from North to South, and to change its character somewhat. The task, in short, was to implement in the press the spirit of President Roosevelt's Good Neighbor policy.

Few people realize how easy it was for Axis propagandists to sell their message of defeatism to readers already half convinced—because the facts in the case had never been presented to them—that this country was soft, weak, and decadent. It was our job to correct this impression, and in doing so, we followed the traditional methods of American journalism. We wanted to have nothing to do with the hated concept of a subsidized press, or with the propaganda methods of a Goebbels or a Gayda. We believed that telling the story accurately and truthfully was the only possible policy for an agency of the U. S. government. And our conviction was supported by the knowledge that any other course would in the long run defeat itself.

This, of course, is true everywhere, but it is of special importance in the Latin American field. First of all, our press associations over many years have established an unrivaled reputation for honest reporting, when compared with such agencies as Domei, D.N.B., Stefani, or Trans-Ocean, which have long been considered notoriously unreliable throughout the hemisphere.

The faith in U. S. news, built up by generations of our journalists, was one of the greatest assets at the start. We have kept to the principle that any procedure, no matter how temporary or superficially attractive, which might impair this faith should be rejected instantly.

Another point which we bore in mind was that there was no necessity to replace or to compete in any way with privately owned and operated news agencies. Our function, as we saw it, was to fill in areas they were unable to reach because so many papers could not afford to buy services at commercial rates.

This is where the Press Division of the Office of the Coördinator enters the picture. Its outlet for the supply of spot news to Central and South America is the short-wave radio and such supplementary material as we can furnish the press associations by way of background. As a strictly business proposition, this division could not have attempted the coverage needed to counteract the Axis programs offered to our southern neighbors. A staff of experienced writers and translators prepares the news, for broadcasting in Spanish and Portuguese, and the material is delivered to the studios of the large short-wave chains by teletype.

Obviously, there was no need to set up any extensive news-gathering organization of our own, and none was set up. We depend on the same wire services used by all American newspapers.

In addition to the news room, the Press Division operates a feature article and news picture service. Its production, which runs, on an average, to ninety columns a week, goes to South America by air mail. This means, of course, that the stories arrive too late to compete with the spot news supplied by the press associations. In practice, they find their way into the newspapers which cannot afford to buy a regular service. Most of the feature and picture material leaves Washington already matted or in the form of plastic mats, in order to make its use easier in remote provincial newspapers with limited plant facilities. Thousands of clips in our files give positive proof that our story of the United States in the war is now going into every part of the hemisphere.

Reciprocity must be a feature of any successful inter-American program, and in the case of the Press Division this consists of making available to our own newspapers, press associations, and magazines background articles and pictures on the other American republics.

Both the air-mail feature and picture service and the spot news coverage for short-wave radio are operated on the assumption that the government will withdraw from these fields at the end of the war. Their purpose is that of doing a necessary, emergency job in an area not yet ripe for private development.

There is actually good reason to believe that the post-war situation for Latin American news services will be much improved, partly because of the activities of the Coördinator's Office. Our neighbors, served today by the Press Division with information about the war and about developments in inter-American relations, will emerge with widened horizons and a heightened appetite for world news, and for pictorial illustration up to professional standards.

Several other Press Division activities are now stimulating that appetite. Reference and background material on many phases of U. S. life, both in war and peace, are being supplied to newspapers, writers and editors. Reprints of U. S. magazine articles are arranged for periodicals in the twenty republics to the south of us. Journalists from Latin America are brought here for intensive studies of our country and its problems. In some cases these journeys have been extended, by invitation of the Canadian government, into the neighboring Dominion. Mexico, Uruguay, Paraguay, Bolivia, Chile, Peru, Cuba, and Argentina have already been represented on these tours.

and the results, as shown in the papers, have been all that could be expected.

The Office of the Coördinator also brings articles on the democratic cause and the United States war effort to the readers of the other American republics through the medium of a monthly illustrated magazine—known in Spanish as *En Guardia* and in Portuguese (for Brazil) as *Em Guarda*. Its circulation has reached six hundred thousand in the course of its brief existence. Many thousands of unsolicited letters, among which are almost no adverse criticisms, attest to the favorable reception of this magazine. Its success has been indicated still further by the flattery of imitation by the Axis nations.

As an additional contribution to inter-American good will, the Office of the Coördinator has extended its active influence and assistance to the solution of difficult wartime newspaper problems, such as transportation of newsprint, air express priorities for syndicate and other material, and clearances for the export of printing machinery.

I should like to emphasize the equally important work done by the Radio and Motion Picture Divisions. Like the Press Division, they are under the direction of Wallace K. Harrison, Assistant Coördinator for Information. They work together as a combat team in the war of ideas. The head of the Radio Division is Don Francisco, former president of Lord and Thomas, which had one of the largest radio departments of any advertising agency. The Motion Picture Division, in charge of Fran Alstock, has enlisted the coöperation of the entire industry in its effort to improve the quality and quantity of U. S. films for Central and South American audiences.

None of us in the Press Division can be classed as theoretical or professional propagandists. Without exception we come directly from newspapers, press associations and allied enterprises. For example, Harry W. Frantz, especially well qualified for his post as the Division's Director in charge of operations, has spent a quarter of a century in the news field, more than twenty years of that time with the United Press Association, as Foreign Editor in Washington. Assignments have taken him all over the world and he has an intimate knowledge of the press and people of all the Americas.

The Division's Assistant Director is Thomas A. Dozier, who came to the Office from the United Press Latin American desk. To head our Current News Section, we selected Robert A. McGill, former Capitol correspondent for the International News Service and a practical newspaperman of long experience. Alexander Murphy, former picture editor of the Associated Press, is in charge of our photographic services.

David Loth, author and former staff member of the *New York Times* and the *World,* supervises pamphlet and poster production. Among others holding key positions in the Division are: Duncan Aikman, author and newspaperman; Paul Jones, magazine writer and newspaper columnist; Martha Dalrymple, formerly with the Associated Press; Fred Gardner, of the *United States Daily* and financial writer for the Associated Press; and Richard Hippelheuser, Associated Press editor and correspondent. The entire list of personnel would show comparable experience and background.

The wide variety of activities which are indicated in this article are necessary because the Office of the Coördinator is the government agency doing this type of work for the other American republics. It was the first agency created by the President with an information task outside the United States; and the Western Hemisphere, excluding Canada, has remained its theater of operations. We have worked closely with the Office of War Information and we are particularly indebted to Robert Sherwood and Joseph Barnes, in charge of the OWI's overseas branch, for their valuable coöperation.

The dedication of the vast majority of the press of the Americas to the cause of the United Nations would not have been possible, of course, without the enthusiastic support of newspapers from Hudson's Bay to the Straits of Magellan. With exceptions noted only for their infrequency, their lack of influence and their obvious Axis venality, the Spanish and Portuguese press of the hemisphere has been a true leader in moulding public opinion into the solid phalanx of inter-American solidarity which is giving to the United Nations a vast treasury of strategic materials, a network of essential bases, invaluable military and naval support, vigilance against all forms of Axis activity, and a heightened morale that is the spearhead of victory.

The quality of journalism in South America has always been high. The standard may be gauged from the fact that hardly a newspaper that can afford a United States news service prefers to take the much cheaper or even free services of European nations. Certainly it is largely because of the influence of these papers and hundreds of smaller, but no less energetic, colleagues that of our twenty neighbors to the south, twelve are at war with our enemies and seven have broken off relations with the Axis. That is a partial but a striking measure of the power of a free press.

DATELINE WASHINGTON

Mr. Wilson was born in Kansas and worked on the *Daily Oklahoman* before he took his journalism work at the Missouri School of Journalism. After receiving his B.J. degree, he entered the service of the United Press, which sent him to London for two years, then called him back to New York to act as cable editor, and finally assigned him to its Washington bureau, of which he has been manager since 1933. Mr. Wilson was awarded a Missouri honor medal for distinguished service in journalism in 1940.

COVERING THE CAPITAL

By LYLE C. WILSON

The Swiss watch mechanism behind today's Washington dateline is producing the story of this country's participation in total war despite some inevitable sanding of the works by censorship and other barriers to the collection and distribution of information. It could not be otherwise in a capital where newsmen long have enjoyed unexampled facilities for reporting and where reporters — until war came—could and often did dare look top officialdom in the eye and refuse to kill or change a story.

Behind the Washington dateline is the tradition of a free press in the best sense of that phrase. And after the passage of many in-and-out years, Washington has ceased to be a national dateline. It is a world dateline now. Under that dateline is breaking the biggest and fastest story newsmen ever have had to handle. If reporting steadily becomes more difficult and circumscribed, the rewards for energy, alertness, and initiative are correspondingly greater.

The mechanics of putting news under the Washington dateline is a measure of the enormous size of the job. In the Washington bureau of the United Press, our telephone switchboard has thirty-nine extensions. They peel off in every direction to the news centers of the city—White House, Treasury, Congress, and such unexpected spots as the roof of the National Press Building, in case we have to observe an air raid some day. Five teletype machines pour additional copy into the news room. They are located in the House and Senate Press Galleries, in the House and Senate Office Buildings, and in the press room of

the Supreme Court. Much of the Congressional copy is handled by those teletypes. There is too much news of Congress to channel through any three, four, or five telephones. But on Capitol Hill there is a complete telephone system linking the news room switchboard with Congress, so that printer copy is heavily supplemented by dictation. From down-town government offices, the reporters dictate over telephone lines.

Where three young men used to sit at the news-room dictation battery, there are three young women. They are a war-time innovation, and they are doing very well. We have seven women reporters on outside runs and one breaking in on a desk job. There are eighty-three persons in the Washington bureau. Personnel has increased steadily since Pearl Harbor. But, in fact, United Press staff and mechanical facilities in Washington had been increasing since the onset of the emergency that began shortly after the market broke in October, 1929. Gradually Washington became the financial capital of the nation, and now it is the financial and supply capital of the world—the nerve center of the arsenal of democracy.

Flash is still the hottest word in press association language. But bulletin-communique is not far behind. So much emphasis do we put on speed that ten seconds more than necessary makes or mars the handling of a story. In the middle of the smooth-running machine stands —I mean stands—Julius Frandsen, the soft-spoken, hard-minded news editor of the Washington bureau. But, first, meet Sandy Klein, the smiling veteran of European and New York assignments, who strides his own quarterdeck for the United Press in the Navy Department press room. Klein for more than a year has been telling newspaper readers the story of Naval reverses and successes as they are disclosed here. He is a cigar-smoking Mr. Five-by-Five whose freehand dictation of fast-breaking news is good to handle.

First word from Klein usually is that the Navy will have a communique in half an hour or so. At the end of that half hour, he and others in the press room have a few minutes to read and digest the announcement and to question naval officers on obscure points—but no time to write a line—before the communique is released. A moment before release time, Klein opens his phone and to the PBX operator says merely, "Communique." Over her board is a push button which immediately sounds the communique bell. It is a firebell contrivance that bongs a warning easily heard over the clatter of typewrters and teletype machines, a warning to clear the decks for a hot

one. During the split seconds before dictation begins, one of the young women puts a previously datelined book of copy paper in her typewriter. Frandsen instructs a trunk-line teletype operator to start a dateline on the wires. By that time the communique is rolling. Today's is a fair sample. The first bulletin was timed off at 12:20 p.m. The second bulletin, somewhat longer, at 12:22, a third at 12:24, a fourth of 15 lines at 12:27, a three-line fifth at 12:28 and a cleanup of 20 lines at 12:33. That is not perfect, but it is fast. The wire showed substantial consecutive "takes," but that story reached the wire a line at a time, sometimes three or four words at a time, as "take" after "take" of copy was pulled from the dictation typewriter. It still flusters our young women some when copy is yanked away from them, but they are learning fast. The file copy shows that this story was pulled in twenty-four separate "takes" from dictation. The pulled "takes" go to Frandsen for an on-the-fly editing, and then to the teletype. During a communique operation or the handling of a hot White House conference or a big break anywhere, Frandsen stands so that he can see everything that is going on as well as edit copy.

It is smooth, and it may sound easy, but it isn't. Consider Klein, who, after three or four minutes to digest a communique and determine what is lead material, literally dictates freehand to hundreds of newspapers and radio stations. If the break comes on an over-lay of day- and night-side time, Klein is dictating to 1,341 newspapers and 619 radio stations. Let Klein make a mistake in dictation or a dictation girl wrongly transcribe the words spinning into her ear—then that mistake may be in London or Chungking before we can detect and correct it.

Merriman Smith, on the White House, dictates one thousand words for every word he writes, and under even tougher conditions than those imposed by communiques. A White House conference is a wondrous thing. They can and do wander all over creation. There are wise cracks and repartee, foolish questions and sound ones. Any one of the one hundred or more reporters in attendance may bring up any subject and most of them do. Smith stands there in the front row and fills a notebook—don't let anyone tell you that real reporters do not use notebooks—and then he literally runs to the United Press telephone booth in the Press Room. It may take Smith fifteen to twenty seconds to hurry through the conference crowd to his booth. That much time he has to decide with what to lead and how to phrase his

opening sentence so that it will contain the socko, headline fact. Smith does it and does it well. And in the news room it is routine to pull copy line by line when Merriman Smith is on the other end of the telephone. His specialty is big news. That is the kind that breaks on Smith's run.

Communiques and press conferences are like set pieces of fireworks. We know where and when to expect them.

The established techniques of press conferences and press releases produce enormous volumes of news. They are great and good institutions. Only the thoughtless would wave them aside, but those same techniques expose the Washington reporter to a dread, occupational disease known as pressagentitis. Its symptoms are the uninterrupted production of routine or non-exclusive stories and the substitution of contact with public relations men for direct personal contact with the policy-making officials who make news. The disease develops slowly. It is one hundred percent fatal.

The big stories and the big opportunities for reporters are here as they always have been, despite censorship and other hazards. They are here for the energetic reporter who in Washington applies sound City Hall or police court reporting practices to the government of the United States. But those techniques must be accompanied by a high standard of intelligence and curiosity. Without those no reporter can expect to comprehend, to say nothing of being able to write concisely about, the complexities of taxation, man-power and—even—politics.

But given the intelligence and energy, the methods that obtained a news beat in Omaha will get a news beat in Washington. The forthright blustery reporter who is all brass and knows his stuff will do just as well—but no better—than the smartly suave reporter whose methods are those of painless extraction. But, in common, they must be smart and aggressive.

Government will prop up and protect the lazy Washington reporter for a bit by providing him with excuses. And by that I mean any government, whether it be administered by a Coolidge, a Hoover, or a Roosevelt. Government will put obstacles in the way of smart and searching reporting, and the lazy reporter who prefers to cover handouts and press conferences exclusively can cite those obstacles and make them seem to be very real. But time and competition will show up lazybones for what he is. On every run there are men and women who are not content with pressagent reporting and press con-

ference explanations but who insist on going behind the pressagent and the press conference to determine for themselves the facts.

The most obvious check on free reporting is censorship. However, the censorship Code is, on the whole, quite fair. But it does circumscribe free reporting and, in some instances, somewhat unfairly. Under the "general" prohibitions of the Code, for instance, it is requested that newspapers avoid publishing: "Premature disclosures of diplomatic negotiations or conversations." That is a typical club-in-the-closet type of restriction. What it actually means is that the State Department, through the Office of Censorship, can at any time decide arbitrarily that some story is "premature" and forbidden. It is a loosely drawn prohibition, and deliberately so. Newsmen protested when it was inserted in the Code, but it still is there.

Actually more hazardous to thorough reporting is the Office of War Information. OWI was set up to coördinate the story of government, to prevent equally responsible officials from making utterly incompatible statements, and to see that the public got all the news to which it was entitled. There have been instances, and important ones, in which Director Elmer Davis has compelled reluctant departments or officials to give up to the public facts which the departments or officials wished to conceal. Furthermore, OWI is eager and ready to help newsmen with many of their problems where a friendly spokesman inside the government frequently can accomplish much. But OWI is becoming the source of a malignant epidemic of pressagentitis. Gradually it is attempting to come between the reporter and the departments, agencies, and public officials the reporter is assigned to cover.

OWI now clears, issues, and releases all statements from the War Production Board, Office of Price Administration, Board of Economic Warfare, Lend-Lease, Agriculture Department, Office of Defense Transportation, Petroleum Administration for War, War Manpower Commission, Selective Service Bureau, Defense Health and Welfare Services, Alien Property Custodian, Fair Employment Practices Committee, War Shipping Administration, Maritime Commission, National Housing Agency, and the Office of Civilian Defense. Moreover, OWI clears and issues some releases for the Labor, Treasury, Justice, Interior, and Commerce Departments and a few lesser agencies.

OWI has its eye on War and Navy Department releases. The danger is that OWI will increasingly urge that all news contact with government be through it rather than the source of the news. That situation does not yet prevail but there are straws in the wind.

On March 5th the United Press reported that "The Office of War Information, which claims exclusive powers to review and release certain information concerning Federal War activities, today sought to learn how some news dispatches have been obtained without OWI permission."

The story continued to explain that press association reporters had obtained prior information on an Office of Price Administration decision to place a ceiling price on soft wheat. OWI came to the conclusion that there had been a leak in the Department of Agriculture. The facts were that the reporters went to men who knew what was going on, asked the right questions and got the right answers—and wrote their stories.

OWI explained that it "does *not* want to curtail the open-door policy that always has prevailed in the dealings of the government with the press and radio and other news media." But the channelling of news for many agencies through one funnel does, at least, set up a barrier between reporters and original news sources. The aggressive reporter can and will break through.

After receiving his B.J. degree from the University of Missouri, Mr. Cornell worked on the Moberly, Missouri, *Monitor-Index*. Later he was on the *United States Daily* in Washington and in 1933 he joined the Associated Press. He has been with the AP's Washington bureau ever since. He was president of the White House Correspondents' Association in 1942-43.

THE WHITE HOUSE BEAT

By DOUGLAS B. CORNELL

Washington reporters are war correspondents, too. Virtually every Washington story of any importance these days has a war angle.

The capital remains, perhaps, the world's greatest single source of news, but reporting is done with an entirely new perspective from one end of Pennsylvania Avenue to the other and at points where the government is sprawling over into the nearby countryside. Stories similar to those which used to command eight-column streamers on page one now are worth a few paragraphs inside.

Back when the Administration was fighting a depression instead of a global war, Congress appropriated four billion dollars for relief. Never in our history had there been an appropriation of that size, and it was chronicled on page one in probably every paper in the country, along with Congressional laments about stupendous expenditures and wailings over an unbalanced budget and prospects that we even might have to raise the forty-five billion dollar limit on the national debt.

Look at the change! Not long ago a six billion dollar appropriation for the Navy was worth a small item on page fourteen of a major metropolitan paper. A bill to raise the limit on the national debt to two hundred and ten billions attracted attention chiefly because the House of Representatives tacked on a provision to cancel a twenty-five thousand dollar top, after payment of taxes, which President Roosevelt imposed on earnings by means of an Executive Order.

Purely domestic stories originating in Washington are a rarity now. Even political stories show the touch of war. The articles that

have been turning up from time to time on a fourth term for Mr. Roosevelt, for instance, always analyze the pros and cons from the point of view of the effect the war will have on the issue. Most of them toy with the idea that if the conflict still is in progress by the time the 1944 political conventions and campaigns roll around, Mr. Roosevelt may feel impelled to try for another term. Or they speculate that even if the war is over, he may want to stay around to help in shaping the peace.

At the White House, the war has forged numerous changes in news coverage and has created some difficulties. The first change came to light a few days after the Japanese smashed at Hawaii. Although it was important chiefly to a relatively few individuals who have to track down stories at night, it did break a ten-year-old policy. There had been several days and nights, after the White House flashed word of the attack on Pearl Harbor, when the executive mansion was almost the sole source of news about the progress of the fighting. Presidential Secretary Stephen Early, a former newspaperman who handles the chief executive's press relations, had been getting home in the small hours of the morning, and then his telephone had kept him awake. So he obtained one with an unlisted number and that has made it difficult for reporters to reach him with queries late at night. The White House switchboard will put through a call to him only if it is considered of utmost importance.

The actual process of covering the White House follows a rather definite pattern. Stories develop at presidential press conferences every Tuesday afternoon and Friday morning, at daily conferences with Early after he has had an opportunity to check with "the boss," from mimeographed press releases or "handouts," and from interviews with the people who call on the President.

Mrs. Roosevelt's press conferences are something apart. She holds them in the living quarters of the White House proper, and only women reporters—who, by the way, are appearing in increasing numbers on the Washington scene—may cover them.

An exceptionally large percentage of presidential press conferences have been cancelled in the last few months. Reporters have known why, even though they have not always been told. But they have been permitted most of the time to say for publication merely that "no reason was given." Back of this voluntary censorship is a necessity for preserving the security of the nation's war-time Commander-in-Chief, as on the occasion of his epochal flight to Casablanca to confer with Prime Minister Winston Churchill. Washington correspondents have to be good at keeping military secrets.

Covering the executive mansion now is a matter of working extremely hard at times and doing almost nothing in dull periods, since the flow of news is less sustained than in other years. There are several reasons for this. For one thing, a list of the President's callers, which Early gives the press every morning, seldom is complete. In addition to the people on it, probably there are as many off-the-record visitors who swish in and out of side entrances and back doors, giving the press no opportunity to question them. This is no innovation resulting from the war, but the practice has expanded considerably in the last year and a half.

Then, too, because of the shift in emphasis to stories with war angles, visits which might have produced major stories in peace time produce a skimpy paragraph or two now. In the past, for example, the bare fact that a Senator or House member of some stature saw Mr. Roosevelt was all many reporters needed as the basis for lengthy "dope stories" or "think pieces" about legislative situations, prospects, and strategy. Now, more often than not, unless there is that war angle, the fact of the visit is recorded along with whatever well chosen words the legislator may care to speak, and that's all.

Many people who see the President either are unwilling to disclose the purpose of their calls or are given to understand they ought to keep it to themselves. Usually they tell reporters: "It was just a personal visit," or "I just dropped in to pay my respects," or "It was purely social." Incredulous members of the fourth estate have a prescription for such cases, and ordinarily it effects a cure in one treatment. When a caller resorts to the "purely social" dodge, he gets a chance to answer this one: "Do you mean to say that in war time, with the President as busy as he is, you came in to take up his time with purely social matters?" Coughing, stammering, blushing, and mumbled attempts at more adequate explanations are the customary reaction as the embarrassed caller streaks for the door.

Lack of access to a new east wing handicaps the men who cover the White House. Perhaps that can be made clearer by outlining first some of the mechanics of White House reporting. As Washington and the tourists who used to come here know, the President lives in the White House proper—the large, central portion which appears on the postcards. The offices are in two wings. Mr. Roosevelt's own office and those of his staff of secretaries and clerks are in the west wing. That is where the chief executive does most of his work and keeps most of his appointments.

There, too, is the press room, with desks, typewriters, and telephones linked directly to news bureaus and newspaper offices. Repre-

sentatives of the three major news services—the Associated Press, United Press and International News Service—make it their headquarters from mid-morning until Mr. Roosevelt leaves his office in the evening. "Specials" covering for some of the larger newspapers, who also keep an eye on the nearby State Department or other agencies, drop in and out. Incidentally, there used to be eight telephones in the press room. Twenty more went in after Pearl Harbor.

In order to "buttonhole" the on-the-record callers and to handle miscellaneous releases, reporters have to remain in the west wing and spend a large portion of their time in a large lobby whose walls are lined with comfortable but somewhat garish saddle-toned leather divans and easy chairs.

At the other end of the White House, nearly two hundred yards away, are the offices of James L. Byrnes, Director of War Mobilization; Harry L. Hopkins, presidential intimate and U. S. chairman of the British-American Munitions Assignment Board; and Admiral William D. Leahy, Mr. Roosevelt's personal Chief of Staff. A tremendous amount of business is being done in those offices. Hopkins helps channel munitions to the spots where they can be used most effectively. Leahy has at his fingertips reports on military and naval operations over the world. Naturally, their activities are of a highly confidential nature.

Byrnes, who has acquired the title of "assistant president," helps control the economic destiny of 130,000,000 people; but newspapermen two blocks away are told almost nothing of what goes on in his office and have no chance to use their enterprise to find out. It isn't a question of taking time to shift over to the east wing. White House reporters are barred from it. Occasionally Byrnes does issue a handout through Secretary Early, or stroll over to the west wing for a press conference. And alert reporters elsewhere in town at times break stories from the people Byrnes sees. One leaked out recently about President Roosevelt's having appointed a committee, headed by Byrnes, to draft a report for him on the man-power snarl, and another a bit later on what was in the report.

Now if there is one thing that irks the President, it is to ask someone for a report and then read in the papers what is in it before it even reaches his desk. That has happened any number of times, and it brings up another matter on which the chief executive is a bit touchy—the airing of squabbles within the government. Last summer he used to pick up his papers—usually he reads the morning editions in bed—and note that one top government official was championing one course or policy, on such issues as shortages of gasoline or rubber,

and another was taking an entirely different tack. The controversies provided some top flight stories.

The upshot of it was that the President sent letters to heads of all federal agencies. He spoke his mind about officials who publicly criticize agencies of the government with which they are not affiliated or who issue statements based on "inadequate information" or on a failure to appreciate all the aspects of complex subjects. He said:

"Where honest differences of opinion exist, no one would propose to suppress them. Nor would anyone attempt to interfere with the free use by every public official of the normal processes of information to the public and press. But it is no solution to a controverted question to argue it out in public.

"If the agencies would refrain from resorting to public debate of this kind, they would have a good deal more time to attend to their business; and the nation would have a good deal more assurance that that business was being done right. . . .

"Disagreements either as to fact or policy should not be publicly aired, but are to be submitted to me by the appropriate heads of the conflicting agencies. The policy of the government should be announced by me, as the responsible head thereof. Disagreements as to facts can be resolved, if necessary, by investigations and surveys directed by me."

Although the President occasionally takes a dig at "certain elements" of the fourth estate, or at columnists and editorial writers, his relations with the press continue, on the whole, to be on a friendly basis. As he said in introducing correspondents to Madame Chiang Kai-Shek, he and the press still are on speaking terms and, he thought, they still like one another.

Moreover, except for appearances before Congress, the only time the President has shown up in public and made an important address, from the time we got into the war until mid-April, was at a dinner of the White House Correspondents' Association last February 13.

Only once since Pearl Harbor has he shown a trace of venom toward any individual reporter or newspaper. That was when a writer for a metropolitan daily printed in a column excerpts from a personal letter from Australia telling of the non-military activities of a former White House correspondent who now is in the Army's Air Transport Command. Shortly after the column appeared, the President had a clipping of it on his desk. Also on the desk was a Nazi iron cross. As reporters filed out at the end of a press conference, Mr. Roosevelt handed the cross to a radio commentator and asked that it be bestowed on the author of the column.

Reflecting the seriousness of the times, press conferences produce less informal banter and joshing than formerly. Sometimes the newspapermen present are too intense in attempting to appraise what the chief executive says. There was the time, for instance, when the President dismissed a subject as r-o-t, spelling out the word in measured tones instead of pronouncing it. A reporter, bent on making sure of his ground and apparently wondering what new alphabetical agency of the government was involved, inquired: "And what does that mean, Mr. President?" Mr. Roosevelt roared.

A few pet subjects are good for protracted dissertations from the chief executive whenever they come up at his meetings with the press. He always is willing to explain in detail the differences between a Congressional authorization for a project and an appropriation which must come along later to supply the money for it. He will talk at length about the necessity for the development of the St. Lawrence waterway for navigation and power purposes. And he will go to considerable trouble to explain what the government has done about cutting down on so-called non-essential or non-war expenditures, together with the difficulty of differentiating such expenditures from those for war operations.

One additional change in covering presidential activities is worthy of mention. That is the fact that reporters no longer are permitted to accompany President Roosevelt on all his travels. In peacetime, they went everywhere he went, and in the summer of 1941 they spent as much time out of town as they did in Washington. There have been only three trips since December 7, 1941, which the press has been allowed to staff, and only men from the three wire services were invited to go along on two of them. One was to Hyde Park, New York, last November, when the President went home to vote. Another was a transcontinental swing a few weeks earlier on which he inspected war plants and military establishments. The third trip, taken last April, took him through the southeastern states, down to Monterey, Mexico, and as far west as Denver.

When President Roosevelt set out last Fall to see the domestic war effort for himself, the "specials" who were left behind got up a petition of protest. There were even fears in official Washington that there might be a breakdown in the system of voluntary censorship on movements of the chief executive. President Roosevelt never gave the petitioners a direct reply. But when he got back to Washington, he said he expected to make another inspection trip this spring—and under the same conditions. However, six "specials" went with him on the first half of the next trip.

SPECIALIZED FIELDS

The author was born in Milwaukee and educated at Harvard University. He became the associate editor of the *Brooklyn Eagle* after a long career on that paper. He is a veteran radio commentator, having begun this phase of his varied career in 1922. Today he is one of the best known radio commentators in the world. He has won a number of significant citations and awards.

THE ROLE OF RADIO

By H. V. KALTENBORN

During World War I, the American people got their war news from "extras" hawked on street corners. During the present war, sixty million radio sets hourly inform America of the latest developments on the fighting fronts. The twenty-five years between World War I and World War II have witnessed the phenomenal birth and growth of radio as a news medium. The speed with which radio can report news and the mass audience it can reach have made it the formidable rival, if not equal, of the press as the primary dispenser of news in this country. It may not dispense all the details, but it gives all the important news first.

Ever since the Munich crisis, impartial surveys have shown that many people in this country turn first to radio for news. In October, 1938, the American Institute of Public Opinion asked a representative sample of the American people the following question: "In the European crisis, were you more interested in the radio reports or the newspaper reports?" Some seventy per cent expressed a preference for the radio. Succeeding crises and the war have shown that this preference has continued.

In August, 1939, *Fortune* magazine asked the question: "If you heard conflicting versions of the same story from these sources, which would you be most likely to believe?" The results were as follows by percentages:

Radio-press bulletin	22.7	Newspaper news item	11.1
Radio commentator	17.6	Newspaper columnist	3.4
Authority you heard speak	13	"Don't know" or "depends"	19.8
Newspaper editorial	12.4		

Considerable controversy was stirred up recently in newspaper, government, and radio circles by the publication in *Broadcasting*, radio's trade journal, of the results of a governmental survey which purported to show that radio has "displaced the newspaper as the public's primary source of news." *Broadcasting's* summary of this report said that the American people "express greater confidence in broadcast than in printed news, on the grounds that it is swifter, more condensed, more accurate, and gives a greater sense of personal contact with personalities and events." Officials of the Office of War Information were greatly disturbed that this survey had "leaked out" and indignantly stated that the government did not prefer one medium over another. Although the press naturally refuses to concede first place to radio, few impartial observers question the general result of such surveys.

Since radio carries great responsibility in keeping America informed swiftly and accurately, it is logical to ask how has it met this obligation? Under what restrictions, under what policies, does American radio operate in wartime?

Is radio censored? Yes, just as every medium of communication—press, magazine, motion picture—is censored. Radio censorship is essentially similar to press censorship. To a large extent, radio relies upon the same news sources as the press. Both use the teletype material of the United Press, the Associated Press, and the International News Service. Both receive simultaneously government releases and announcements.

Radio, as all other media of American opinion, has a tradition of freedom of speech. The tradition is in its infancy, but it is there. Naturally, radio is jealous of its freedom. But there are some peculiarities of radio which have necessitated special restrictions. To deal with these special problems, a radio division was set up in the Office of Censorshp. It is significant to note that the head of the radio division, J. Harold Ryan, is a veteran broadcaster and was selected after a special poll taken among leading radio executives. Radio's particular problems stem largely from the fact that radio programs can be heard by enemy ears outside this country. Radio could not assume that what was right for the press was equally right for broadcasting. Radio waves cannot be censored at our borders in the same fashion as tele-

phone, cable, radiogram, and mail transmission. Because radio transcends frontier control, it was necessarily placed under stricter supervision than the press. As Mr. Ryan has pointed out:

"No broadcaster's coverage map describes his audience completely. Within range of his station's signal are thousands of loyal, liberty-loving Americans; but listening, too—and be certain you believe this—are those who would throttle the institutions and the traditions we believe in. That's what the war's all about. And that's what censorship is all about."

Together with representatives of the broadcasting industry, the Office of Censorship drew up a Code of Wartime Practices for American Broadcasters. This Code establishes specific do's and don'ts for their guidance. News material is carefully considered in the light of the provisions of the Code. Specifically, the Code prohibits the broadcasting of news (unless specifically authorized about weather conditions, troop movements, strength or location, ship sailings and sinkings, damage and sabotage by the enemy in the United States, munitions production statistics, and "military secrets."

The broadcasting of rumors or unconfirmed reports is frowned upon, as are stories "calculated by the enemy to bring about division among the United Nations." Caution is also advised "against reporting, under the guise of opinion, speculation or prediction, any fact which has not been released by an appropriate authority." Also to be avoided is news which plays up horror or sensationalism. These are some of the specific provisions of the Code which, with a few minor changes, has been in effect since January, 1942. As with all written documents intended to govern future actions, difficulties have arisen about interpretation. Thus far the censors have been liberal in permitting departures from some aspects of the Code to go unpunished if not unchallenged. Censors permitted me to describe the defenses of the Panama Canal in general terms in a broadcast from the Panama Canal Zone, but when a Panama Canal Zone newspaper reproduced the same material, as an interview, the censor clipped the words Panama Canal from the story before permitting it to be sent to me by mail. All censorship subordinates sometimes do stupid things through excessive caution. The important thing is that our policy is and remains liberal.

Fear of government censorship marked the early days of broadcasting in this country and those concerned with establishing the American system of broadcasting took great pains to secure freedom of speech on the air. The first Amendment to our constitution, that "Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech, or

of the press," was not considered a sufficient guarantee, and a specific clause prohibiting government censorship was written into the Radio Acts of 1927 and 1934.

During the early twenties, Herbert Hoover, then Secretary of Commerce, called a series of conferences at which representatives of the infant radio industry and the government met to evolve what has since become the American system of broadcasting. At these conferences, the bases of later radio legislation were laid down. In 1924, the third of these conferences passed a resolution which declared "that the policy of non-interference in programs sent out by the broadcasting stations should be upheld. Any other attitude would necessarily involve censorship in some degree." This same conference reported:

"After an extended discussion of the details of making recommendations to the Conference, it has been deemed advisable that the Department of Commerce, as in the past, take no steps to regulate the material broadcast from any station in the country, as it is believed that each station desires to cover a certain field and to educate or entertain a certain class of people. To regulate the programs under these conditions would mean censorship, therefore official censorship is not recommended."

In 1925, a policy was definitively formulated, with the declaration, "that any agency of program censorship other than public opinion is not necessary and would be detrimental to the advancement of the art."

From these declarations, which were echoed later in Congressional debates on radio legislation, it is evident that those who laid down the principles of American radio were greatly concerned with the possibility of government interference with free speech. Seeking to implement the First Amendment, they sought to establish guarantees against govrnment censorship. And so today Section 326 of the Communications Act of 1934 provides:

"Nothing in this act shall be understood to give the licensing authority the power of censorship over radio communications or signals transmitted by any radio station, and no regulation or condition shall be promulgated or fixed by the licensing authority which shall interfere with the right of free speech by means of radio communications."

Those who established our system of broadcasting legislated wisely for the future. Until this country's entrance into the war, there has been no real instance of serious governmental censorship of radio programs. The American tradition of free speech has been maintained.

The war has made restrictions necessary—but these have been made in the democratic tradition. The provisions of the Code were worked

out by the radio industry in friendly *collaboration* with the government. The Code is enforced by a member of the broadcasting profession. Our government has not imposed arbitrary restrictions. Instead, it has made the broadcasters virtually their own censors.

Contrast this procedure with the tactics followed in Europe, where radio has always been an instrument of government propaganda. In Italy, before the war, Mussolini himself insisted on personally censoring some of my broadcasts. In Germany, Hitler's American broadcasters were graded according to their supposed degree of friendship for the Nazi cause. Even the League of Nations forbade my continued use of the League's wave length on a commercial basis to report the progress of the Spanish Revolution in 1936. I had infinitely less freedom in broadcasting from Europe in peace time than I have here in war time.

The Roosevelt Administration deserves criticism for many things, but as an editor and broadcaster I am deeply grateful for its jealous defense of free speech on the air.

Born and educated in Iowa, Dr. Gallup received his advanced degrees at the State University of Iowa. He taught journalism at that institution, and later at Drake, Northwestern, and Columbia. In his doctoral thesis he developed the technique for analysis of reader interests by interviews which has taken its place as a standard method. In 1935 he founded the American Institute of Public Opinion. He is at present director of the Institute, as well as director of research for Young & Rubicam.

PUBLIC OPINION—PRO AND CON

By GEORGE GALLUP

There are two great realms of journalism. The first is *what people do;* the second, *what people think.* Newspapers through their reportorial staffs and news services have covered with ever-increasing speed and efficiency the first great realm. The function of the modern public opinion poll is to provide a systematic coverage of the second realm.

Although new techniques for polling public opinion are being developed and old ones improved, actually there is nothing particularly novel about the effort to discover and report the people's ideas on issues of the day. For years many newspapers have regularly sent reporters to interview the public or to talk to members of various groups, such as farmers, local politicians, business men, organized labor, and others, to attempt to gauge the public's attitudes towards problems of the day. The task that polls undertake is essentially the same in principle; but modern sampling surveys try to do the job on a much broader scale and by procedures evolved in recent years and tested in hundreds of different situations.

In 1935 the press took the lead in sponsoring opinion surveys in the United States. Today approximately one hundred of the nation's newspapers underwrite the work of the American Institute of Public Opinion. England has had its continuous sampling poll since 1936, sponsored by the *London News-Chronicle* and other newspapers, and affiliated with the American Institute of Public Opinion. Within the past two years, similar polls have been organized in Canada with the

support of twenty-six leading Canadian dailies; in Australia under the aegis of the *Melbourne Herald* and five other newspapers; in Sweden with the coöperation of *Dagens Nyheter,* Stockholm's largest daily. All make use of techniques which have been developed during the last few years from experience gained in these various countries.

It is no accident that the press takes the lead in covering this new realm of journalism—*the news of public opinion.* Historically, there has been a close relation in the public's mind between newspapers and public opinion. The press has always supplied most of the facts and comment on which public opinion is based. It is only natural that the public should look to the press to report and interpret public opinion.

The way in which sponsoring newspapers have reported the results of public opinion polls provides an effective answer to the critics who, on occasion, charge the press with unfairness. Despite the fact that many reports of public opinion on bitterly contested issues have conflicted violently with views expressed on editorial pages, not a single instance has come to light where a sponsoring newspaper has deliberately changed the facts or interpretations in a single Institute release to fit its own editorial views.

The systematic effort to report public opinion at regular intervals overcomes what Walter Lippmann has described as one of the greatest weaknesses in modern journalism. In his analysis of the press, in *Public Opinion,* Mr. Lippmann noted the effective organization of newspapers to cover one phase of world events which he describes as "overt" events. At the same time he pointed to their complete lack of organization to cover the whole area represented by ideas—the thinking of people. In fact, he went so far as to say that the greatest problem of the press, as well as the greatest problem of democratic government, was to create and organize a "machinery of knowledge" which would permit them to describe and report more accurately the whole field of ideas and social phenomena. Modern methods of public opinion measurement make possible the reporting of opinion at any given point of time. And, what is perhaps of even greater importance, these methods make possible the reporting of trends in public thinking on issues of the day, since polls can measure opinion at intervals of days, weeks, months, or years.

The spread of education, the increase of literacy, the development of facilities of rapid distribution of information to all the people, have made public opinion an increasingly powerful force in modern society. As James Bryce pointed out some fifty years ago, public opinion is the "real ruler of America." Not only is it all-important

in democracies, but even in dictatorships it is a force to reckon with. Even in a period of war, public opinion is still the dominant force.

Wendell Willkie, in *One World,* speaks of "democracy's greatest driving power—the whip-lash of public opinion, developed from honest, free discussion," and goes on to say: "In every country I saw around the world, I found some kind of public opinion operating powerfully both on the course of the war and on the slowly emerging ideas of peace."

He declares that it was public criticism of the constant failures in North Africa at the time of Rommel's successful advance in the summer of 1942 that brought about a change of British command there. The new command subsequently pushed Rommel three-quarters of the way across Africa, and in Mr. Willkie's judgment some of the credit for this victory "should be chalked up to British public opinion." Even in countries under authoritarian rule, the governments have elaborate methods of determining what the people are thinking. "Even Stalin," wrote Mr. Willkie, "has his form of 'Gallup Poll.'"

Thus there is a special and peculiar interest in public opinion polls in wartime. Moreover, as I shall point out later, we may look forward in the period of post-war reorganization to world-wide reports of public opinion on great international issues.

* * *

Although journalists do not have to be told that public opinion is important, they frequently overlook the fact that public thought almost invariably precedes public action. While Congress does not always interpret correctly, nor act swiftly upon majority opinion, still the polls have found that majority sentiment is sooner or later translated into legislative acts. That in itself is an important fact for journalists. If the majority of the people reach a conclusion which Congress later acts upon, then obviously public opinion bears watching. A thorough grasp of national opinion is essential to an editor who seeks to appraise the future.

The extent to which public opinion has been ahead of its leaders is a matter of record. For example, a majority of the American people wanted a greatly expanded air force six years before Pearl Harbor, when many so-called experts were decrying the importance of air power. By the time war broke out in Europe in 1939, the people were overwhelmingly in favor of stronger air power. Yet seven months later, in March 1940, Congress, when asked by the Army to appropriate money to build twelve hundred air planes, voted enough money

to build exactly fifty-nine. It was not until many months later that Congress caught up with public opinion on this matter.

Likewise, the public supported conscription more than four months before Congress agreed to it. When the lend-lease issue came up, the public was again found to be ahead of Congress. The public took the lead on the important matter of broadening the income tax base, on price-wage control, on drafting eighteen- and nineteen-year-olds into the Army. In fact, on virtually every major issue of recent years, public opinion has been weeks, months, and even years ahead of Congressional action.

* * *

The individuals who have made it their particular job to measure and report public opinion have adopted the viewpoint that their job begins and ends with reporting the *facts of public opinion.* They have not been concerned in any way whatsoever with trying to influence public opinion or, for that matter, with defending it. The defense of public opinion has been left to others. The poll takers have attempted to emulate the various press associations by covering news of public opinion in the same impartial and objective manner that these organizations cover world events.

Many leaders have renewed their faith in democracy and the common man from the weekly reports of public opinion in the United States. In an address before the War Congress of American Industry, Dr. Robert A. Millikan, famous physicist and winner of the Nobel Prize, declared:

"One may be discouraged about the Administration, about Congress, about the Supreme Court, about the racketeering of labor leadership, about political corruption, about many ominous tendencies in American life, but he cannot be discouraged about the way the common man seems to be understanding and correctly appraising, on the average, the American situation as reflected by the [Institute] polls . . .

"Most surprising of all, the votes on aid to Britain, and on international coöperation generally, have shown a quick and wholesome response to changing conditions, thus reflecting unexpected flexibility of mind and quite amazing discrimination, insight and lack of prejudice. Herein lies the hope of our democracy. The average American as reflected in these polls has both a head and a conscience."

After citing a number of Institute poll results, Dr. Millikan concludes:

"If all this does not show that the average American has more intelligence and more conscience than his political leaders, then I don't know straight social morals when I see them. . . . The press, the radio,

the movie, and the schools are certainly *rapidly changing the average American and he will educate his representatives or replace them. With him as king, the future of America is secure.*"

• • •

The ultimate place which this new field of journalism will have in American life will depend not only on how well it serves journalism, but also on how well it aids and abets democratic government. On this point no greater authority can be cited than Lord Bryce, who still remains the greatest student of the American form of government. "The obvious weakness of government by public opinion," Bryce said in *The American Commonwealth,* "is the difficulty of ascertaining it." The modern sampling poll has done much to overcome this weakness. In three particular respects does it aid democratic government.

As Bryce pointed out, it is impossible to define the mandate of the people in elections in this country, for the very simple reason that elections mix issues as well as personalities. On only rare occasions can the voter express his opinion directly on an issue. Typically, he has to vote on a candidate and trust that this candidate will somehow correctly represent his views on important issues. This system has glaring drawbacks. In the election of 1920, for example, the League of Nations issue was thoroughly confused and obscured. In 1928 a Republican who wanted to cast his ballot for Hoover knew that his vote would undoubtedly be construed as a vote in favor of the continuation of prohibition. Conversely, the voter who wanted to cast his ballot for Al Smith but who also wanted the country to remain dry, knew that his vote on this issue was likely to be misconstrued.

Every election poses a similar problem. And until a time comes when voters are permitted to register their views on issues at the same time as they vote on candidates, the public opinion poll will offer the best way of ascertaining the will of the people on particular issues.

Likewise, Bryce pointed out that elections come only at fixed intervals, whereas issues may come up at any moment. Events never wait upon elections. The importance of this fact was so great in the mind of Bryce that he declared that the next stage in the development of our democracy would be reached when the *will of the people could be known at all times* without the aid of regular election machinery.

Since the time of Bryce, pressure groups in the United States have assumed greater and greater importance. Having no one to deny their claims, it is only natural that spokesmen for various large special-interest groups of the population—laborers, farmers, business men, veterans, and others—should loudly assert that they speak for the

millions of persons included in their particular groups. With the advent of the public opinion poll, many of the claims of these spokesmen have been invalidated. On a number of occasions, labor leaders who have claimed to represent the views of all their constituents have been found actually to represent only a minority. This has likewise been found true of many of the claims of farm leaders and others who pose as spokesmen for special-interest groups. The public opinion poll is today the *bête noir* of the pressure group.

* * *

The various methods employed in measuring public opinion are far from perfect. But steady progress is being made from month to month and year to year. Problems which loomed large a few years ago have been solved in most cases, and today the remaining few are yielding to experience and research. Progress has reached a point where it can safely be said that the periodic sampling of public opinion is here to stay. There are still horse-and-buggy skeptics who question the validity of the methods, just as people in Pasteur's time scoffed at the idea that disease could be carried by invisible bacteria, but their ranks are rapidly thinning.

Enlightened editors today know what can be done with public opinion research methods and, what is equally important, what can't be done with them. It is as foolish to believe that these methods are perfect as it is to deny their validity. Perfection, however, is seldom reached in any field, and certainly it can be said today that the reporting of public opinion has reached as high a level of accuracy as the reporting of events by even the very best news staff.

The measurement of public opinion involves no secret formulae. The methods are the same as those used in many other scientific fields. But there are still those who confuse these methods with "straw vote" polls of earlier years. Largely for this reason, many people, remembering the fiasco of the *Literary Digest*, believe that modern surveys will run into the same difficulties; and, of course, there are still politicians of the old school who are unwilling to admit that the sampling of an accurate cross-section of the voting population of the country by modern methods is superior to their own "goose bone" methods. But the new generation of journalists and politicians will lean more and more heavily upon facts rather than upon hunches to guide them in appraising public opinion.

The early era of "straw vote" polls dealt almost entirely with election predictions. The possibilities of measuring public opinion on issues of the day at regular intervals were not envisioned. Even to-

day some critics who have become partially converted to the idea that opinion polls can measure the public's attitudes on candidates in an election still deny that these same methods can be equally accurate in measuring public opinion on issues.

Experience, however, shows the fallacy of this view. During the last eight years polls have been just as accurate in forecasting votes on issues as on candidates. In Canada, for example, the Canadian Institute of Public Opinion, using methods developed in this country, measured at regular intervals the division of opinion on conscription for overseas service. When Canada decided on a nation-wide plebiscite, the Canadian poll not only predicted accurately how French Quebec would vote, but forecast with a margin of error of only four per cent, how all of Canada would vote on this issue. Many other instances could be cited to prove the accuracy of modern polls on issues.

Some persons still wonder how sampling surveys can accurately measure the division of opinion of the entire nation on issues or candidates by polling only a few thousand people. The answer, of course, is to be found in the law of averages, or the laws of probability. These laws, first described some two hundred years ago, apply to all sampling data when drawn from an accurate cross-section. The margin of error can be predetermined in any survey. For example, in a survey of three thousand persons, properly selected, the statistical odds are 997 in 1,000 that the error will not exceed 2.74 per cent. Stated in a simpler way, this means that the figures reported from a typical survey of three thousand would correctly forecast the views of the sixty million voters of the nation if this entire group went to the polls and voted on the same question. Great numbers, therefore, are not a prime determinant of accuracy. In fact, there is to date no record of a nation-wide poll which has gone wrong because it included too few people in its sample.

Of far greater importance is the selection of the cross-section—that is, the people to be interviewed. The piling up of thousands or millions of cases in a national survey will not eliminate error if the cross-section is faulty in the first place. The Institute's statisticians have devoted years to the study of cross-sections, and have examined the voting history of each of the three thousand counties in the United States. Their task is to select voters who together will represent a correct sample of the entire population. To accomplish this, the sample must include a proper proportion of voters by (1) states, (2) men and women, (3) type of community, ranging from rural to urban, (4) age groups, (5) income, (6) past voting behavior, (7) religion, (8)

racial background, (9) education, and by such other factors as analysis may indicate to be important.

The third factor in determining accuracy has to do with the way questions are asked. Experimental work during the last few years has shed much light on the problem of how best to put issues to the public to gauge the division of opinion; that is, the division which would result if the issue were put to the entire voting population in a plebiscite or referendum. Research in this field indicates that there is no one best way to put questions to the public. In the early stages of discussion of an issue, the simple reportorial question: "What do you think about this issue?" may be best. In intermediate stages, attitude scales may be required in order to describe public opinion. But in the final stages the question invariably reduces itself to a simple "yes" and "no" alternative. At this stage it is possible to predict how the public would actually vote in a referendum on an issue, and the present aim of public opinion polls largely centers on reporting this division.

Many refinements in methods have been introduced in recent years. Through techniques in use today, it is possible to report *informed opinion* when this is desired, and it is possible to report with some accuracy the intensity of opinion on a given issue. Work in this field of intensity of interest is still continuing. It can confidently be said that, in time, the intensity of opinion will be measured as effectively as opinion is now being measured on a quantitative basis.

One aspect of this problem of intensity confronted public opinion polls in the last election—the question of turnout. When fewer than half of all voters go to the polls, the ones who do go are obviously those who are most interested in the candidates or issues. Since elections are decided by those who actually take the trouble to vote and not on the basis of the views of all the people, it is a matter of prime importance in polling to be able to discover which persons will actually cast their ballots on election day and which will stay at home.

This problem, like others, is being solved with experience gained in the course of covering many elections. In the off-year election in 1942, the Institute underestimated Republican gains by some thirty-five seats, largely as a result of the low turnout factor in that election. The Institute's prediction was based on a forecast of Republican party strength nationally of forty-eight per cent, which was an underestimate of Republican strength by 3.8 percentage points.

In the course of covering some 115 local, state, and national elections, the Institute has kept its predictions within an average of four per cent of the true figure. Through the years the average error has

been reduced from six per cent to less than three per cent. The time will never come when polls will be right in every election. And with the same certainty that statisticians know polls can, on the average, be within three or four per cent of the true figure, they know this margin of error will lead them, on occasion, to forecast incorrectly the winner in a close election where the difference in the vote is less than this figure. Not only are the probabilities of error of a few per cent inherent in every poll, but such extraneous factors as corruption, weather, and last minute events, can operate to increase this error.

The chief aim of public opinion polls is not, however, to predict elections but to report public opinion with a high degree of accuracy. Except as a journalistic stunt and as a way of convincing the public that polls can be accurate, little value comes from predicting elections. This part of the work of the poll-taker will come to be regarded as less and less important in years ahead. The chief value of public opinion surveys, and the field in which they will concentrate in the future, is the measurement and reporting of public opinion on major questions confronting the country.

In another field public opinion research is making a major contribution to journalism through its charting of "areas of ignorance." Often it is just as important to learn what people do *not* know about a given issue as it is to record the division of opinion of those who know enough about it to have an opinion. More and more, this type of information will be reported for the guidance not only of newspapers, but for educators and government officials who need to know what information the public has, or, on occasion, what misinformation it has been given. Editors who are sincerely interested in informing the public can do so much more intelligently when they know just what knowledge the public has on a given issue and what opinions grow out of this knowledge.

* * *

As stated earlier, those in charge of public opinion polls today have no interest whatsoever in influencing Congress. They believe that it is the duty of every man in political office to base his decisions upon his own best judgment. But obviously in a democracy what the public thinks ought to be an important factor in helping him to form his judgment. For this reason, the man in political life should have a correct appraisal of public opinion—not an appraisal based upon hunch or guesswork, upon statements of pressure groups, letters, or the views of local politicians. The public opinion poll offers him an impartial and an objective report whose accuracy can be, and has been, tested on many occasions.

Not only do the directors of polls today have no interest whatsoever in influencing Congress, but they have no interest in influencing voters. The charge that is sometimes made that polls not only report but influence public opinion has never been able to stand up under scientific analysis. The "band wagon" theory, held by many politicians, is largely a figment of their own imaginations. There is abundant proof from scores of surveys both on candidates and issues to show that people do not change their views merely to be with the majority. If the "band wagon" theory actually operated, then the candidate who was first reported to be ahead in a campaign would invariably increase his lead as persons abandoned the minority candidate to support the person who seemed to be winning. Actually, in most elections the candidate who is ahead at the beginning of the race either seldom changes his position or actually loses voters as often as he gains voters. The evidence from polls on issues as distinguished from elections is equally conclusive.

* * *

The journalist of tomorrow must be schooled in the accurate reporting of opinions as well as in the accurate reporting of events. The usefulness of public opinion surveys to journalism and to government is beginning to be grasped; it will become more and more evident in the future. This war, above all others, is a people's war, which has put the civilian under fire as well as the soldier. Governments are more acutely sensitive to the will and desires of the people than ever before.

The time is not far distant when it will be possible to report the views of the common people in most of the democracies of the world on great international issues. The existing survey facilities in Britain, Sweden, Canada, Australia, and the United States will make it possible to study and compare the views of the citizens in those countries on any given post-war problem, and to determine how much agreement and how much disagreement exists. As surveys extend to other countries, literally the whole area of world thinking on political, social, and economic problems can be gauged. When that day comes, a great stride will have been taken toward bringing the people of the world into closer under understanding, and another great opportunity for journalists will have been opened.

Mrs. Herrick holds degrees from Northwestern University and the University of Chicago. She began work for the *Chicago Tribune* in 1918. A few years later her series on immigration conditions attracted wide attention, required a trip to Ireland, and resulted in a summons to testify before a Congressional committee. Mrs. Herrick has been a member of the *Chicago Tribune's* Washington bureau for a number of years. She is now associated with the War Department's Bureau of Public Relations.

THE NEWSPAPER WOMAN JOINS UP

By GENEVIEVE F. HERRICK

War does not "make" a newspaper woman. But war does give a newspaper woman greater opportunities and wider fields of activity, both geographical and journalistic.

I speak with some autobiographical authority for I began my newspaper work during the last war just a month before the Armistice. It would be dramatic as well as utterly fantastic to say that World War I pushed me, a novice, on to page one. It did not. It did, however, give me an opportunity of becoming an assistant exchange editor of a large metropolitan paper.

Candor compells me to point out that an exchange editor is an amoebic form of journalistic life, and realism impells me to ask, "What then is the status of an *assistant* exchange editor?" Anyway, because no man was available for, or perhaps agreeable to, the job, I got it. From that minor stronghold of shears and paste-pot I sought to enlarge the radius of my activity. Gradually, not spectacularly, new opportunities deevloped. The man who covered the outlying police districts was off in France—"Give the new girl a crack at it!" The man who used to do such sprightly feature stories was in training camp. "Somebody's got to do it; see if the new girl can make anything out of this story."

Slowly and not at all surely my typewriter began to pound longer stories; stories that before the war would have had "that masculine touch."

What happened when the war was over? Floyd Gibbons came back

and we all met in the local room to present him with—of all things—a bunch of American Beauty roses. He didn't edge me out of my job because, of course, he didn't want my job. Charles MacArthur came back and we dogged his footsteps to pick up the latest whimsy from Paris. He didn't seek to pry me out of my job because, indeed, he had a much better one.

Other newspapermen of lesser name and fame returned to good jobs. That was as it should have been. But there was no stark mathematical displacement of women by returned soldiers. I am inclined to think there never is. In the general reshuffling to a peace-time basis many of the women who had been hired by the newspapers all over the country left. Some, because they wanted to, to go back to their homes with their returned soldier husbands or to marry returned soldiers. Many others, who in the emrgency had been accepted as acceptable, weren't really very good. Perhaps they knew it and many of them in a casual way—there was nothing overnight about it—left for quieter pursuits in which they were better qualified. Still others, trained in wartime, remained in peacetime.

I have an idea that somewhat the same situation prevails today and will take place tomorrow. Because this war is bigger, the military demands on writing men are greater. This means, it seems to me, the opportunities for civilian writing women are accordingly greater.

In a few cases the unusual woman will have unusual opportunities. For instance, Inez Robb is in Northern Africa for International News Service, and Ruth Cowan is over there for the Associated Press. Both women are doing unusual jobs, but then, they do good work in peace time as well as war time. The unusual woman is likely always to have unusual assignments.

As a feminine footnote to Ruth Cowan's safari to Africa, women journalists will weep, as men journalists may laugh, at this sad tale. Before she left for "destination unknown," Ruth, who is very personable and likes a soft frock as well as a hard assignment, spent a lot of money getting a lot of clothes; not silly clothes, but chic clothes. When her wardrobe was completed and her purse quite depleted, word came from the War Department that she was to wear the WAC uniform—or some derivative of it. No frills nor fringes; but khaki uniform and comfortable (horrid word) shoes. It was just one of those blows that lady journalists have to take in their stride—sometimes a sensible stride in stout stockings.

Other women colleagues of mine are in London, perhaps a dozen of them, doing sustained. careful and sometimes brilliant work. But they too were doing good work before Pearl Harbor.

What of the women who stay in the home office? Well, war, this war, has brought them into new and solid significance. The woman's angle has become a definite part of national geometry. The woman's page is bedded in war time civilian economy.

Food is not only an item of daily consumption; it is an item of daily conversation and consideration. Government officials, radio commentators, politicians—all are talking food. The woman's page food editor may feel extremely satisfied that she is performing a truly important war service.

Every official who comes to speak before the Women's National Press Club in Washington, and nearly every official does, gives a puff to the woman's typewriter by pointing out how vitally important it is in this emergency. Part of this, I know, is merely polite puff. But I also know that today the woman's typewriter is so sturdy a journalistic machine that it is not likely that it will readily soften into fluff and froth even when peace comes.

Women journalists will not write *the* war stories. To say so would be foolishly feministic. However, the war story could never be fairly and adequately written without women journalists. To deny this would be stupidly anti-feminine. This is the woman journalist's opportunity. I think she is making the most of it.

Mr. Hansen was born in Iowa and educated at the University of Chicago. He was a correspondent for the *Chicago Daily News* on the war fronts of World War I and at the Peace Conference. In 1926, after several years as literary editor of the *Chicago Daily News*, he joined the *New York World*. He has been with the *New York World-Telegram* since 1931. He is the author of a number of books, the latest of which is *The Chicago*, and was one of the contributors to *Writing Up the News*.

BOOKS AS DEMOCRATIC WEAPONS

By HARRY HANSEN

To understand the tremendous growth of topical writing in books and its relation to the newspaper we have to recall the great change in the reading habits of the American public between the first World War and the second. When the war of 1914 broke out, writing standards were already changing; old academic barriers were being broken down and a young iconoclastic, frank and forthright generation was describing American life. The drama had been taking up social problems since the 1890s; poetry was breaking from classical forms and many newcomers were expressing themselves in free verse. By the end of that war there was vast curiosity about everything—foreign affairs, the manners of the earth and the laws of the stars. Rules for writing were set aside and authors with fresh, unfamiliar attitudes produced novels, biographies and topical books. In consequence books became important fare to thousands of new readers and their subject-matter as valuable to the newspaper as the program of a concert or the action of a play.

When the second World War broke out, bookstores and libraries had been flooded with books about foreign affairs for a generation. It is a safe guess that while some of them were trial balloons, most of them were published because the public was sufficiently large to make this profitable. The usefulness of books for clarifying the issues of the war became immediately apparent to writers and publishers; and to establish standards and unity of expression two organizations were formed, the Council on Books in Wartime, representing pub-

lishers, booksellers and librarians, which was to "achieve the widest possible utilization of books contributing to the war effort," and the Writers' War Board, which was inspired by the Authors' League and asked the coöperation of editors and writers in preparing suitable material for publication in newspapers, magazines, books, and radio programs. These organizations and their affiliates now form a vast network of activity and enlist the part-time activity of many writers.

These two organizations are carrying on an important experiment in stimulating the curiosity of the public and encouraging it to read along certain lines. The Council on Books in Wartime uses the slogan: "Books are weapons in the war of ideas." It publishes recommended book-lists and originated the device of calling attention to the merits of a book by designating it as "Imperative." The first book so designated was *They Were Expendable,* W. L. White's account of the final hours in the Philippines; the second was *Into the Valley,* by John Hersey, and the third *One World,* by Wendell Willkie. The Council also encourages the writing of books that exemplify democratic ideas and endeavors to help the circulation of useful, patriotic works by the publication of recommended lists and the coöperation of libraries and newspapers. These lists have been well chosen; they appeal to many tastes in reading and endeavor to clarify issues in the interest of a wholesome American attitude, stressing our responsibility in world society.

More recently the Council on Books in Wartime has been given the function of choosing books for reading by the men in the armed services ocerseas. Books new and old are chosen by its committee; these are printed in paper-bound editions of huge size, with the text two columns to the page. Since the original publisher concedes practically all profits the books are not available in the civilian market; they are intended only for distribution among the troops.

The Writers' War Board has been active on many fronts and is much more combative than the Council. It is especially emphatic in denouncing anti-Semitism and isolationism, and some of its forthright attacks have caused criticism of its methods. It helps initiate articles and books, coöperates with the Office of War Information in preparing material for foreign consumption, and interests itself in radio programs.

The present world war strikes much deeper into the minds of men than the first world war did, and this is reflected in the books of the hour. During the first world war the enemy was still an artistocrat, allied with landowners and covetous industrialists. The war was fought to make the world safe for democracy—that is, to guarantee

self-rule and self-determination, the right of people to elect their own representatives. The people in whose name we marched were the middle class. Mr. Britling, who saw it through, was a member of the middle class. In the present war the aristocracy has no voice, and the heavy industrialists are not leaders but servants—with the state shaping up as a powerful organ of social change in both hostile and friendly countries. Since this is a war of ideas as vital as those on the lips of men at the twilight of the eighteenth century, our books reflect debate and controversy as did the books of the American and French Revolutions.

This has made possible the extreme position advocated in the slogan of radical organizations: "Every book today must be a weapon in democracy's fight against fascism." The argument behind this, as I have heard it explained by those who approve of it, is that books shape the minds of men so drastically that they can stir us to action or lull us into sleep and cynicism. They declare that a book must not merely conform to war aims, but that books not doing so are not worth writing, printing, or reading. They ask that books on subjects remote from war efforts or reporting be postponed for the period of the war.

Here, it seems to me, the newspaper reviewer has a duty to perform; he must keep the channels of thought flowing and must record the writing of the day no matter where it leads. To concentrate on one side of an argument is the logical procedure of dictators and propagandists. We can no more close our minds to debate than to reports of bad news. The strength of democratic morale is built on complete knowledge. To draw the line and say one view is defeatist, while another is constructive, is too big a job for self-appointed censors. Treason and inciting to violence are other matters; they are not involved in a meeting of minds. No one is going to write and print books that directly injure the armies in the field or the war industries at home. Policies, however, are open to debate. Democratic government presupposes discussion of issues. The newspaper reviewer must look behind such labels as fascist, isolationist, totalitarian, and defeatist to see who applies them and why and whether they accurately designate the writer's point of view.

* * *

Book reviews are not recent discoveries of newspaper editors. They have been associated with news reports from the earliest days. At one time they were "marine intelligence," which announced the arrival of ships carrying flutes, English china, and "books newly

published by the Messrs. Tompkins in the Poultry." When the editor got around to it he wrote a paragraph or two about the latest English novel, for he was a reading man. Invariably he thought of books as the products of genius and scholarship, no matter how mistaken such genius might be.

The newspaper review has long since moved away from the academic ideal. The fine, balanced essay on a book, carefully avoiding any reference to the personality of the author, giving equal weight to content and technical performance, still has its place in the weekly book sections, especially when they approximate magazines. But it is less useful in the daily review. In the daily review we have to make the best possible use of newspaper space. To preëmpt a large slice of it for an academic discussion of style would be speaking to only a few in a medium addressed to many. Many readers would leap over the book review column to land with huzzas among the comic strips. There have been editors who produced newspapers for an intellectual aristocracy, but they were not long for this world.

A score of years ago every college graduate believed that the only training necessary for reviewing was a knowledge of English literature and a scholarly attitude. Today aspirants agree that newspaper experience is also valuable. It is no longer possible for the local minister to take James Russell Lowell as his model and discuss an author's work in terms so remote from daily life that only his parishioners will read him. Newspapers cannot afford to be so generous with their space. They have to rely on reviewers who see books as the communications of human beings like themselves. And unless a message is comprehensible to the majority of intelligent readers, it gathers dust on library shelves, consulted only by specialists.

It is true that many colorless reviews, devoted chiefly to telling "what the book's about," still appear in newspapers. In the larger cities, a definite personal expression, sometimes highly individual, is associated with the daily book review column. But even here the writer must meet the test as a newspaperman. Some of the most successful writing in this vein was done by Heywood Broun in the 1920s. That was a decade of exciting discoveries in books, and Broun was in the forefront of the newer, iconoclastic element. Another good newspaperman who influenced his whole generation in favor of uncompromising honesty and directness is H. L. Mencken. These men were effective because they were more than recorders; they represented youth and energy and were best in attack. The director of war information, Elmer Davis, at one time conducted a book review column with the same conciseness that we find in his news comment on the

air; his columns had less feeling and more intellectual depth than those of Broun, but they were typical of newspaper practice in their directness and lucidity.

Reviewing for the newspaper is strongly influenced by barometric changes. While John Dewey puts in a lifetime amplifying a basic point of view, countless minor thinkers advance theories and points of view; the reviewer must take account of all. In times of transition, hesitation, ferment, or whatever term we apply to this period of shifting standards, people are not likely to hold fast to one literary faith; they drift from one attitude to another. In the days of Haseltine and William Winter, aesthetic and philosophical values ranked higher in the public estimation than verisimilitude. Photographic realism was not a reason for praise. Technical standards demanded conformity to half a dozen patterns; characters could not be static (as they are so often in life) but had to show growth and development, and missteps had to be compensated. So rigid were critical standards that when an author broke completely with conventional attitudes in his book, the reviewers would have nothing to do with it and it was mentioned only in the news columns, as a sensation deplored in Sunday sermons.

Our interest in books as news demolishes the fiction of the ivory tower. Today the critic has a finger on the public pulse and an eye on wind currents. He sees trends and movements affect authors and their product. In one decade the issues swung from a complete break with literary form (in *The Waste Land, Ulysses, The Tunnel*) to a quick reaction by conservatives eager to put the spirit back into writing (the Humanist movement) followed immediately by a widespread emphasis on political revolution and reform, leading to the Marxist movement, in which authors tried to show how economic determinism affected the lives of individuals. These events hardly contain the germs of what a city editor would call a good story, but no reviewer could appraise books unless he kept step with them. If he sympathized with a movement, he probably spoke with more force than if he merely recognized its existence; but he had to know what was going on.

The Wall Street crash of 1929 and the subsequent depression resulted in economic theories becoming news. In the decade from 1930 to 1940 the public was eager to know what hit it and why. Writers on political science and economics had their innings and some of them made seven-week reputations on the study of a lifetime. The best remembered forerunner of this agitation was the free silver period of the 1890s, when monetary theories grew out of vast unemployment, pamphleteering flourished and the public debated economics in barber

shops and on street corners. The period of 1930-1940 was exceptional because of the great swing to radicalism of the younger intellectuals, especially in the large cities where forums flourished. Like the anti-slavery agitation before the Civil War, it penetrated fiction. Scores of young men and women began writing novels to prove that the material fortunes of men are dependent on their economic opportunity, and that in the United States this opportunity had favored only a few who had used it to exploit the many. The view of one authority that when intellectuals become radical a revolutionary upset is brewing gained great credence. The soap-box orators of Columbus Circle moved into Carnegie Hall, and instead of passing the hat for nickels and dimes passed pledge cards for the signatures of the wealthy. The Communist party formed John Reed Clubs to teach young writers how to express the class angle in novels, poems and plays. While many of the novels were cut to a pattern, there were many honest attempts to go down to bedrock and get at the basic truth of an economic situation. Though the "proletarian movement" in writing is now judged a failure, it is not to be dismissed summarily, for it made many young writers look critically at their material and question their social assumptions. It sent many to vocational school. It failed because it presented only one facet of American life, took account of only one influence. The same stricture applied to reviewing and criticism according to the Marxist formula. As Sainte-Beuve proved repeatedly, many factors help to make the creative individual.

This movement had a definite influence on newspaper reviewing. By 1933 there was extensive interest in economic writings. The most-read reviewers were those who could discuss the class struggle and social planning. It was a little hard on reviewers who had been trained to look on literature as the expression of the spirit and the imagination. The only poetry that seemed to count was the poetry of social revolt; novels that pictured a strong individual making his way without benefit of collective support were condemned as romantic or, worse still, anti-social. "Literature of escape" became a term of opprobrium. Like the humanist movement before it, the proletarian movement was too exclusive. An organization can enforce an index expurgatorius, but the creative imagination will not be harnessed. Soon the big theories split into many little theories, like dying comets. The radical basis of writing became involved in the arguments of Stalinists versus Trotzyites. American thinkers learned that they could not trim their sails to the varying winds of European politics. Confidence that the abuses of capitalism could be reformed and democracy made to work in the United States returned. By 1940 the

atmosphere was by no means romantic, but the individual was coming back into his own as a creative artist.

* * *

Today the center of literary activity is New York City. This includes not only the writing and making of books, but the vast business of disseminating news about books, promoting authors and editions by methods of which Dante was ignorant but Shakespeare might have had an inkling—recommendations by interested parties, promotion departments, publicity agencies, lecture bureaus, forums, interviews on the air, spreads in the pictorial magazines, and public appearances of authors at luncheons, dinners and receptions. This concentration in New York City is unavoidable, but it is to be deplored. It is caused by the fact that New York is the market-place, where editors, publishers, and theatrical producers buy the wares of the writer. There are healthy writing groups in San Francisco, Atlanta, Hollywood, Boston and Chicago. The last, with its middle-western area, has sustained several literary movements since 1900. But the presence of editorial offices continues to make New York the literary capital, even though many magazines and books are actually printed elsewhere.

The radio was quick to see the possibilities in books for broadcasting. Stories could be dramatized and authors could speak for themselves and thus establish a vocal personality. But book reviews, as such, have never brought in radio revenue and remain part of institutional, cultural, and "sustaining" activities. The most serious of the book programs, "Invitation to Learning," made no concessions to the general listener (brother of the general reader) but addressed itself for two years to people of fine intellectual taste who were expected to know what the book under discussion was about. Recently attempts have been made to broaden the base, as the statisticians say. Other programs use books as accessories. In "Information, Please," emphasis is on remembrance of things read. In Ted Malone's programs the central note is human interest and literary adventure. In Alexander Woollcott's book programs the book was often an afterthought and the anecdote held the listener.

With the development of public interest in the making of books, the publicity and promotion man has widened his field. But the impetus came less from publishing houses than from newspaper and magazine editors, who recognized the human interest factor in feature stories about books and authors. Periodicals like *Time* knew that their readers were interested as much in the personalities of authors as in their books. When one of Ernest Hemingway's novels was pub-

lished, *Time* produced a page of photographs, revealing Hemingway from the curls of babyhood to hair-on-the-chest. *Life* sometimes reviews a book in a series of photographs showing the close relation of the story to everyday living, as in the *Kitty Foyle* number.

When the city desk of a newspaper gets wind of a book or an author (with a capable press agent fanning the breeze) it is likely to see "the story" in terms of personality. And authors make good copy. Louise Dickinson Rich, coming out of wintry isolation in the Maine woods, meets reporters in the formal French suite of a New York hotel and talks about cooking for a snowbound family. Quentin Reynolds, back from the bombings, recalls for reporters some robust experiences not in his books. Even George Santayana probably would be interviewed not on the ideas in his books but his impressions of life abroad during war time. Sometimes the literary editor beholds, in his own newspaper, interviews with authors whose writing is so turgid and uninteresting that he can only conclude that the city desk fell for good looks.

Book publishers are still divided between the conservative and the enterprising. The latter are also the daring. There are older houses that will never be associated with publicity stunts. To them publishing is a dignified profession, related, in spite of their commercial astuteness, to scholarship and art. They will arrange for quiet interviews with an author, for receptions and teas, but never for noisy and spectacular events. Other houses dramatize their authors, wangle positions for them as chairmen of conspicuous meetings, try to get them on "Information, Please," and, if possible, would have them autograph books in the middle of Ringling Brothers' circus. Some of this stimulation is thought up by publicity representatives who are hired by the book or by the month. They work best when the author is picturesque and photogenic and the book, secondarily, is likely to prove popular. It is my observation that they can help introduce an unknown, but unless the writer has meat in his book they can give him little more than a shove into the spotlight. I may add that authors are most amenable to this exploitation. One of the chronic fears of authors is that their books will be allowed to die by the publisher, who "doesn't advertise enough."

The effect of these activities on the newspaper is both good and bad. News may be classified according to its origin as both fresh and hot-house. Hot-house news needs forcing. In discovering that authors are good for interviews, that the public likes to read about them, we have widened our field of interest. The public now knows that authors not only write; they cook, play bridge, paint, sail boats, and make trips

to Reno. But often the publisher takes advantage of us. He palms mediocrities off on us. He stresses human interest instead of scholarship. He pays publicity agents to wangle free space out of us, instead of buying our columns at the regular rate for advertisements. The problem is similar to that of the theater. We give "shows" and actors no end of free space because people like to read about them, even if only a small proportion of the population ever sees an acted play. Hollywood is practically as necessary to a newspaper as baseball. Books are not yet as important to circulation as theaters, but they are related to home reading and cannot be ignored.

* * *

Book news and reviews are one segment of cultural activities. From the point of view of the business office they do not always bring in the bacon. Publishers in New York are unable to buy large space in all the newspapers across the country that sit on their doorsteps. They concentrate on several New York media that have established themselves by hard labor and get national attention from booksellers, librarians, and institutions of learning. Today the earnings must be considerable, even making allowances for the high cost of keeping book sections up to standard in the business competition of New York's two great morning media. But the newspapers did not embark on these reviewing sections with the belief that they would become as lucrative as the financial sections. They built for quality circulation and it paid them in the aggregate returns. Louis Wylie, late business manager of the *New York Times,* once told me that his book section was no great money maker. "We clear about $50,000 a year," he said, indicating that this seemed like a mere tip. And at that time, when the financial section was earning a million or two, it was small pickings. But, said Wylie, it helps sell the rest of the paper. Since then the earnings have increased many times, especially in view of the large book space sold in the daily.

Newspapers always have difficulty retaining their individuality. They conform in appearance to the prevailing styles, unless someone with the conservatism and tenacity of Adolph S. Ochs and Victor F. Lawson refuses to change the typography, come hell and high water. Sometimes this is a good thing. We all have horrible memories of what editors did to the front pages of newspapers a few years ago under the spell of "streamlining." Some pages even looked as if they had been assembled from the hell-box.

Book reviews have a tendency to conform, but never too radically. Today they invariably are timely, stressing the book of the day. Pub-

lishers were quick to see the advantages of adherence to release dates, both for bookstores and reviewers. They made the publication day of a "big book" an excuse for a fanfare, as if it were a theatrical premiere. Much to my chagrin I have been guilty of sacrificing basic importance to timeliness, rectifying my mistake with shame-faced amends some time after. This suggests that timeliness can be abused.

Books and authors increase in value to a newspaper with the growth of all cultural activities in a community. A city that supports a symphony orchestra, a university, several colleges, a town hall forum, and a radio station of its own must be building a huge audience of people whose interests demand mental food. Young people are especially attracted toward such activities through the schools. Teachers everywhere encourage them. And yet I have visited cities of importance, with populations of 100,000 or more, in which newspapers gave practically no attention to news in these fields. I remember a large western city, with a state university and an agricultural school a few miles out of town, in which the newspapers seemed aimed solely at the horse trader on Main Street. University leaders told me that when they wanted publicity for their efforts they had to visit the editors; they were treated cordially, but always felt that the editors were making concessions for old times' sake. To develop news in cultural fields was not in the tradition of newspaper-making in that city; the "movies" took care of that appetite. These newspapers were prosperous, so no great changes were planned. They could go along for years buying features from their syndicates and playing no part in the cultural development of their own communities. Yet they had an opportunity to help in regional fertilization, preparing the ground for their own young artists and thus defeating the magnetic attraction of the metropolitan centers. The importance of book reviewing is not always immediately apparent to the business office. But when a newspaper becomes so well established that it is valued more as an institution than as a bulletin board, it invariably recognizes the place of those cultural and educational activities of which book reviewing is a part.

The present general manager of the Advertising Federation of America was born in Nebraska and studied at Nebraska Wesleyan University before he entered the Missouri School of Journalism. He has been active in international movements in advertising, having had general charge of arrangements for the first International Advertising Congress in London in 1924, and of the second Congress in Berlin in 1929. He received a Missouri honor medal in 1936.

ADVERTISING IN THE WAR EFFORT

By EARLE PEARSON

It is not surprising that advertising should have an important part in winning the war. Advertising has long since won recognition as an essential factor in the development of the industrial enterprises of America. Now these gigantic industries are today turning out the ships, planes, tanks, guns, ammunition, and indeed, all the supplies that equip our fighting forces. Before appraising advertising contribution to the war effort, let us take a quick look at the part advertising has played in our present-day industrial development. Our country is vast in area, rich in natural resources, with both a temperate and a tropical climate, and an energetic people who long ago set about to develop these resources, build factories and a system of communication, and, through inventive skill and hard work, provide for themselves the highest standard of living the world has ever known.

Advertising thas been a part of all of this. Beyond the simple necessities, we could hope to manufacture goods on a mass production basis only providing we could stimulate sales on a mass basis. In the process of building the means by which we could turn what were once the rarest luxuries into commonplace necessities in millions of American homes, we developed the technique of large-scale advertising and mass-sales promotion, and the mechanics of exploitation. This called for the services of advertising executives, copywriters, commercial artists, market researchers, poll samplers and public relations experts. Many trained specialists had to direct and carry out the sales and advertising

policies of American industry. A highly specialized branch of business developed.

As the means for the distribution of its messages, advertising has a competent free press—newspapers, magazines and periodicals, business papers, and the agricultural press—besides radio, outdoor advertising, direct mail, car cards, and window displays.

Thrown, as we were, into a fight for the preservation of our freedom and the free institutions we have built in this country, it was only natural that advertising should be called upon to assist the press in making Americans the best informed people in the world in this time of national crisis. Shortly after the attack on Pearl Harbor, the facilities of many private companies, as well as of the advertising associations, were mobilized in a small but thoroughly representative group. This is the Advertising Council, organized for the purpose of placing the services of advertising at the disposal of the government.

In a message to the 38th annual convention of the Advertising Federation of America, which met in New York in June, 1942, President Roosevelt addressed himself to the subject of advertising and its part in the "total war effort" in these words:

"My congratulations to the Advertising Federation of America for the way in which its members already have contributed of their time and skill to the war effort.

"It is obvious that there are many changes going on in your field. For the duration there will be a diminution in product advertising, but this does not mean an end of advertising.

"There are many messages which should be given to the public through the use of advertising space. The desire for liberty and freedom can be strengthened by reiteration of their benefits.

"If the members of your organization will, wherever possible, assist in the war program and continue the splendid spirit of coöperation which they have shown during the past year, advertising will have a worthwhile and patriotic place in the nation's total war effort."

Before the organization of the Advertising Council or of the Campaigns Bureau of the Office of War Information, individual local and national advertisers were making effective appeals for the sale of defense stamps and bonds and were giving point and purpose to the projects of the numerous civilian defense organizations that were springing up throughout the country. Since we entered the war, advertising has performed four increasingly important services. It has promoted the spirit of patriotism and fostered national unity. It has informed the public of war-time measures. It has clarified confused regulations issued by government bureaus and agencies. It has

done much to create favorable public opinion toward necessary restrictions. Advertising has many other wartime tasks, some of which I shall mention later. For the moment, we'll look at these four vitally important ones.

The President, in his message to the Federation, said: "The desire for liberty and freedom can be strengthened by reiteration of their benefits." Note he uses the word "reiteration." We don't reiterate in the news columns. Advertising, on the other hand, makes effective use of reiteration. Hence, when we want to drive a point home again and again, we take advertising space in the newspapers, and the effective use of that space calls for an entirely different treatment from that used in the writing of a news story. By what better means can we stir the public to a spirit of patriotism than by means of repeated advertising messages in the press, on the air and in colorful posters?

Here was a challenge to the skills of advertising men and women. As to how well they have responded, I need only remind you of the stirring appeals for the preservation of liberty and freedom that have been published in our newspapers and magazines and have been emblazoned in full colors on the poster panels across the country since liberty and freedom were endangered. America's most brilliant copywriters have made their contributions, almost without number, and have won distinction for themselves and the companies they represent.

It is the opinion of many in advertising circles that the most popular of these heart-throbbers is the famous advertisement of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Company, "The Kid in Upper 4." *Newsweek,* in its issue of January 11, 1943, says of this now famous advertisement:

"For a long time Nelson Metcalf, thirty-year-old advertising copywriter for the Wendell P. Colton Agency in Boston, has been annoyed by a sight common on crowded trains—weary and perhaps homesick young soldiers, bound on furloughs or transfers, forced to stand while smug civilians scrambled for all the seats. Such scenes etched pictures on his mind that would not leave.

"So two months ago, when the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad ordered an advertisement appealing to civilians to cut down on travel, an idea was ready to race from Metcalf's typewriter. It was simple stuff, the thoughts of a kid lying awake in an upper berth, away from home for the first time, bound for the wars—the story of the Kid in Upper 4 . . . 'Wide awake . . . listening . . . staring into the blackness. . . ' Then, decorated with a wistful sketch of a wide-eyed boy, the ad was slipped quietly into several northeastern newspapers, for the New Haven is a regional road.

"But the Kid didn't stay buried long. Elmer Davis, chief of the Office of War Information, and Joseph B. Eastman, director of the Office of Defense Transportation, persuaded the New Haven to give the ad national circulation in two hundred newspapers and twelve national magazines. Now the Kid is something of a national sensation."

Walter J. Weir, at that time advertising copy chief with the Lord & Thomas advertising agency, now vice president in charge of creative work for Kenyon & Eckhardt, wrote a little piece for *Printers' Ink*, published March 13, 1942, under the title "Fighting Mad." It was the product of a skilled advertising copywriter who sensed the need of bestirring the public from a position of complacency to a fighting-mad spirit, the up-and-at-'em spirit so essential in preparing for and in winning wars. Weir's piece was widely published by the business press, the newspapers, and the magazines of the country, and was broadcast in fighting tones over the air. It is one of advertising's notable contributions to the war effort, and incidentally it preceded the date of the President's challenge by several weeks.

These inspirational appeals have stimulated the various war financing campaigns of the Treasury Department. They have served to speed up recruiting. They have given the workers in war plants new incentives to work harder and produce more. They have added many tons to the piles of scrap metal. In short, they have aroused the public to their responsibilities on the home front in this titanic struggle for survival of all the things that we hold precious.

Informing the public of war-time measures through advertising requires less inspiration and very much more organization. This has called for the close coördination of the work of the Advertising Council and of OWI in coöperation with the numerous government departments and offices that make the rules. I refer to such departments as the Treasury, Agriculture, Army, Navy and Marines, to OPA, OCD, ODT, WMC, WPB, etc.

In March of this year, the Advertising Council was at work on twenty-two campaigns in coöperation with what was originally known as the Bureau of Campaigns of the OWI, now known as the Office of Program Coördination. These twenty-two are listed as follows:

Man-power, war plants
Man-power, farm
Man-power, women
Rationing, processed foods
Rationing, meat
Rationing, dairy
Inflation
Latin America
Farm goals
Victory gardens
Information security
Absenteeism

Tires	Black markets
Car sharing	Appliances, household
Oil	Conservation, household
Civilian defense	Local coöperation
Nutrition	Railroad and bus travel

The metal salvage campaign launched last September, the promotion of which was handled largely by the newspapers of the country through the work of a special committee of distinguished publishers appointed by the president of the American Newspaper Publishers' Association, was one of the most spectacular advertising and promotion campaigns of the present war.

The newspapers launched this highly successful campaign at the personal request of Donald Nelson, head of WPB. It was reported that there was but a two-weeks' scrap supply in the hundreds of steel mills throughout the country. The newspapers were asked "to devise a means of quickly collecting at least four million tons of scrap metal that would never reach the steel mills through established commercial channels." Admiral Robinson, U.S.N., visualized the job to the newspapermen by describing the needed tonnage as "enough to build several times more battleships than there are today in all the fleets of the world combined."

Said Donald Nelson: "There are two methods by which we can do this job. One is to hire an aggregation of government people, probably millions of them, to go around and do it. The other is to organize the thought and action of the American people so that they will handle it themselves. That is the method we want to use. . . . If American effort is properly centered and focused on this problem, it will be licked. . . . If you can exercise for us the leadership in your community to do this job, I know that we can be satisfied that the job will be well done."

The exact figures covering the amount of metal collected in that drive will never be known. The committee reported six weeks after the campaign started that figures compiled from various states showed a total of well over six million tons—more than twenty-five per cent above the quota. On October 16, Mr. Nelson said that the job was "absolutely unprecedented in this country. It has been magnificent."

On December 1, 1941, Frank Tripp, general manager of the Gannett Newspapers, issued a statement in which he reported that the Gannett papers used 124 pages of display advertising in the scrap campaign in the twelve Gannett cities, 217 pages of news stories and 120 pages of pictures.

Advertising is used in clarifying, explaining, and presenting the reasons for the regulations of government bureaus affecting the daily habits of the people and perhaps causing some inconveniences in the normal processes of living. The best examples, of course, are in the rationing of foods, gasoline, fuel oil, tires, etc.

Take foods, for instance. The grocery manufacturers have cooperated fully with officials of the Department of Agriculture and the Office of Price Administration in making as palatable as possible the necessarily complicated regulations in the rationing of food. Paul S. Willis, president of the Grocery Manufacturers of America, in a radio broadcast on March 30, 1943, stated that the members of his organization were then undertaking to popularize the following government food projects: (1) explanation of America's 1943 food problems; (2) farm production goals; (3) victory gardens; (4) point rationing; (5) nutrition and food conservation; (6) farm manpower. In the first three months of this year, according to Mr. Willis, the grocery manufacturers devoted more than twenty million dollars to informative advertising of these six projects. Oil companies and tire manufacturers have also performed similar services.

In addition, we have industry telling the public, through advertising, that it must curtail the use, for example, of the telephone. The need is, of course, clear. We are all aware of the fact that the telephone system is carrying an unprecedented load through the greatly increased use of their service in essential war work and with only slight additions to equipment since we entered the war. The American Telephone and Telegraph Company has expended a considerable proportion of its advertising appropriation in urging the public not to use the long distance telephone, especially to Washington, unless it is absolutely necessary to do so. Says Harry W. Wilcox, advertising manager of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company: "We have evidence to the effect that our advertising has been helpful in getting these messages across. While the volume of telephone calls, particularly long distance, is still increasing, we believe that the advertising has kept it from increasing at a sharper rate. In addition, our advertising has produced a very sympathetic attitude on the part of the public toward our service problem. Complaints are at an all-time low."

Here we have an example of advertising working in reverse, urging the customer *not* to buy the goods.

In all these campaigns, and in many more, radio has played an extraordinarily valuable part. It is radio's first participation in a World War, and now we wonder how we could do without it.

Outdoor advertising has demonstrated its effectiveness as a channel of communication in the war effort, as it did in the last war. Since Pearl Harbor, there has been a steady stream of messages from the government to the people displayed by the outdoor medium of communication.

Perhaps the most outstanding poster design to come out of the war to date is the "Flag Poster," the most gorgeous and graceful American flag, in colors, that has probably ever appeared in print. This is but one of a series of posters that have been used in the many government programs, with telling effect. Tributes from highest government officials to the outdoor advertising industry are abundant proof of the value they place on this medium and its contribution to the war effort.

One of the broadest projects thus far cleared through the Advertising Council is the "total war" campaign which has been running in three hundred national magazines with a combined circulation of more than seventy million. A war contribution of the nation's magazine publishers, this campaign was designed to stimulate civilian participation in war activities. Powerful art and copy has dramatized the civilian's stake in victory and urged enlistment in home front work through local civilan defense councils. A dozen leading advertising agencies, enlisted through the American Association of Advertising Agencies, put their talents and facilities at the disposal of the magazine campaign; and typographers, photo-engravers, electrotypers, and related graphic arts services have likewise made contributions on a generous scale.

The graphic arts industry has been alert to its responsibilities. In April of this year, the Graphic Arts Victory Committee published a *Guide to Essential Wartime Printing and Lithography* to show how printing and lithography can help in the war effort. It is a 52-page brochure full of ideas for advertising campaigns on problems connected with rationing, transportation, conservation, salvage, war production incentive drives, nutrition, victory gardens, anti-inflation, civilian defense, U. S. war savings bonds, morale, security of war information, wartime education and numerous miscellaneous subjects of varying degrees of importance.

The cost to the heavily-burdened taxpayers for the services of advertising in the war effort has been a mere fraction of the sums paid by industry and donated by the press, by radio, and by the owners of the other media to which I have made all too scant reference.

Elmer Davis, director of the Office of War Information, issued a statement in late March of this year from which I quote a few excerpts:

"It has been stated by Congressman Ditter that OWI ought to

coöperate with organized groups from radio, press and motion pictures to get war information to the people. That has been OWI's policy from the start and will continue to be.

"The press, radio, magazines, motion pictures, and advertisers of America have gladly spent many hundreds of millions of dollars to carry war information to the American people. OWI has a current domestic budget of only nine million dollars. If OWI were to attempt to do the entire job of war information by itself, it would require a budget of many hundreds of millions. OWI believes and will continue to believe that the job of informing the people can best be done through established media, and that the main task of a government office of information is to secure the coöperation of these media and to give them materials and information which they require. . . .

"It is estimated that the newspaper and magazine space cost of food advertisers alone who are adapting their copy to campaigns suggested by OWI will be in excess of sixteen million dollars in 1943. When all other types of advertisers are included, it is estimated that the total space these people will have generously turned over to war information projects will come to well over one hundred million dollars."

Among the advertising organizations working with OWI, Mr. Davis listed the Advertising Council, the Advertising Federation of America, the American Association of Advertising Agencies, the American Newspaper Publishers' Association, the Association of National Advertisers, and many other specialized groups.

The Second War Loan campaign to raise thirteen billion dollars achieved its extraordinary success largely through advertising. Full pages appeared in the press throughout the country. It was one of the most gigantic selling campaigns in history.

In the spring of 1942, the Board of Directors of the Advertising Federation of America saw the need for a statement of the new wartime responsibilities of advertising. The director of our Bureau of Research and Education, Alfred T. Falk, was delegated to prepare this statement, which was published as a "Guide for Wartime Advertising Policies." Following a brief outline of the functions of wartime advertising, Mr. Falk lists these thirty-nine specific tasks for wartime advertising:

"Continue all normal distribution functions that do not impede war effort.

"Maintain channels and trade contacts for future needs of industry.

"Preserve customer good will.

"Keep brand names alive.

"Prepare to build markets for post-war output of enlarged capacities.

"Keep enterprises alive and capable of resuming full employment.

"Preserve desire for eventual higher living standards.

"Discourage lowering of present living standards beyond necessary restrictions of war.

"Help maintain freedom of press, radio, and other information facilities.

"Guide buying of consumers with newly increased purchasing power.

"Stimulate use of products that can be supplied in plenty.

"Educate consumers on conservation, care, and repair of articles in use.

"Help to spread out seasonal demand, reducing peaks in transportation requirements.

"Discourage hoarding of commodities.

"Explain elimination of frills in merchandise and service.

"Explain substitution of materials.

"Inform public on reasons for product scarcities and delays.

"Deny false rumors of scarcity and rising prices.

"Explain industry's part in war effort.

"Foster national unity.

"Promote intelligent patriotism.

"Glorify service with our fighting forces.

"Arouse enthusiasm of workers for production achievement.

"Educate public on nutrition and other health matters.

"Cooperate in campaigns for avoiding waste and collecting salvage.

"Help sell government bonds and stamps.

"Assist in financial campaigns of voluntary service organizations.

"Help in organization and conduct of home defense.

"Assist in recruiting of specialists for armed forces.

"Aid in promoting re-allocation of skilled labor in war industries.

"Avoid advertising devices that draw upon critical materials.

"Avoid disclosing information useful to the enemy.

"Avoid giving unsupported information or misleading impressions about the state of the nation or the progress of the war.

"Avoid mere boasting of advertiser's patriotic service or technical achievement without conveying helpful information.

"Avoid panic advertising based on threats of higher prices and scarcities.

"Avoid waste in advertising.

"Continue efforts to make merchandise advertising as helpfully informative as possible.

"Aid and encourage the movement for education of consumers toward more efficient buying for satisfaction of needs.

"At all times, do everything possible to help preserve our American system of free competitive enterprise."

This Guide is as useful today as it was when it was written. It has been widely distributed in advertising circles and has directed many an executive's thinking and planning in these difficult times.

Speaking in his capacity as director of Domestic Operations of OWI, Gardner Cowles, Jr., summed up the responsibilities of advertising in war-time in an address last February at the annual Advertising Awards Dinner in New York. He said:

"Today Americans are ready to make sacrifices. If anything, they want to make more sacrifices in order to get on with winning the war. But specifically as to the details of each government program, too often they are confused and unconvinced. They are unconvinced in large part because they don't have full enough information on why a program is necessary and how it works.

"And that is where advertising should come in. In my opinion, even with the help of all the editorial and news channels open to us in OWI today, we need advertising. Advertising is the only force powerful enough to do the job. It is the only one which can put these government programs before the public in simple, exact terms *often enough* and with *enough power* and with *enough control* to get results.

"The war on the home front can be won, in my opinion, and should be won, without giving up the traditional free character of our media and of advertising, provided the media owners, the agencies, and advertisers realize advertising can and should and must be geared to help with war problems on the home front.

"I think it is important to remind ourselves of one of the fundamental functions of advertising. Advertising, coming from thousands of different private companies from coast to coast, supports the information media which make democracy possible. I do not want to see that important relationship of private business to media altered even in this war time."

SPECIAL PROBLEMS

A native of Mexico, Missouri, L. M. White has spent his professional life in that community. His father, a great newspaperman, was owner and editor of the *Mexico Ledger* before him. Mr. White entered his father's shop as printer's devil at the age of twelve. He has been president of the Missouri Press Association and of the Missouri Associated Dailies. He is now vice-president of the Inland Press Association. In 1943 he received an honor medal for distinguished service in journalism from the School of Journalism of the University of Missouri.

THE MANPOWER SITUATION

By L. M. WHITE

It is the purpose of the writer to present a number of recommended solutions of the present man-power situation which have been tried and found to be satisfactory and to review, as well, other experiments which are now under test. The situation is a serious one in every department of most newspaper offices.

The short courses in journalism in the Universities of Missouri, Minnesota, and other states will contribute substantially toward easing the situation. But, in many instances, the shortage of manpower is too critical to permit a delay of several months, while students are preparing themselves for newspaper work. The overnight development of a vacancy in a position of critical importance to the life of the newspaper, and perhaps to the sanity of the editor or publisher, demands instant attention; unnecessary delay must be avoided.

A number of small city publishers who had several staff vacancies, with little time to fill them, fortunately have found in their own communities women and sometimes men who "always wanted to write" or sell. Often these men and women have an innate sense of news or selling, and if given a little intelligent direction develop an ability to "pinch hit"—and in time to do very creditable work. This is easy to suggest, but not easy to accomplish. However, there are a sufficient number of instances where it is being done successfully to prove the plan is practical and at least worthy of serious trial.

Here is a case in evidence. The man is past draft age; he had

been in private enterprise but was not successful; he had tried several business fields. At the time the newspaper required help, he was seriously considering leaving a job which was paying him a living wage, but did not satisfy his ambitions. Through his previous business experience he had various contacts with advertising, directly or indirectly. The man-power problem was hurricaned down on the local newspaper, taking from the business office one of its advertising solicitors. The hitherto unsuccessful business man felt he could sell advertising and that the work was in line with his interests in the past. If given a chance, he was convinced that he could earn a good living for himself and family and bring to the newspaper a dignified segment of the community advertising lineage. He applied for the place and was frank about his business experience and his qualifications. He did not oversell himself. His greatest asset, he acknowledged, was a determination to work tirelessly and to prove his value. All he asked was a trial. His frankness and personality secured the job. His willingness and determination, intelligent attention to business, and insatiable seeking for sound advice and instruction from the man he was replacing, all contributed to efficient work. The result was a doubtful prospect who quickly developed into an excellent advertising salesman.

The experience made such a deep impression upon the publisher that he did not wait for the next vacancy to occur and for someone to apply. He anticipated the future and arranged to have a prospect selected and ready when the selective service took the next man. In this instance, success wasn't as outstanding, but the new worker, a woman, developed slowly and eventually covered the job assigned her with satisfactory results.

A far-sighted publisher in a small town had donated an old job-press, an imposing stone, some job type, and other equipment to the local high school. The vocational training classes took immediate interest in the printing outfit. Naturally, the press and equipment suggested doing job work for the school, thereby eliminating a source of profitable business for the local weekly, which also does the community's commercial printing. However, the mimeograph had long since been in use at the school, and had curtailed income from that source. The addition of the job-press stimulated youngsters who had a leaning toward newspaper work and printing to start their apprenticeship. Some of the school forms, which had been mimeographed in the past, were now set by hand and printed—and a much better product resulted. The school authorities appreciated the gift of the equipment. They saw to it that there was no

less commercial printing from the school than the newspaper had been receiving in the past. In fact, the result was a greater appreciation of neat business forms and a profitable increase in school printing. But above all, the training the youngsters received at the school, in classes taught by the weekly's printers, who were paid from government funds, developed a pool of well-trained compositors from which the local weekly and nearby newspapers profited when the man-power shortage developed.

In our own office we have published, as a regular feature of our newspaper, a page devoted to high school news. The copy is written and edited by students from the junior class who are interested in newspaper work. They are under the direction of a teacher who has been in charge of that activity for several years. The students read the proof, correct errors, then make up and justify the page. It consumes practically none of our staff's time because the teacher is a deft supervisor. It is intensely interesting to look back over the years and recall the number of outstanding successes, successes which required some knowledge of the mechanical side as well as the editorial, who have been staff members of this high school feature. From the large staff that starts at the beginning of the year, there will be some who lose interest, and the result will be a small but earnest group deeply interested in the weekly undertaking. That they apply themselves well is evidenced by the fact that this school has won first place in intra-state competition fourteen times out of sixteen contests. Aside from all this, the feature is a popular one. It adds to the school's benefits to the young people of the community, and to the reader-interest in the newspaper. It is definitely a potential pool from which to choose likely cubs and apprentices. Other newspapers which have this feature are having the same experience in helping to solve the man-power question.

In many instances today, the situation is such that you'll have to do most of your own training with the best material available. With us, this simply is history repeating itself. The *Mexico Ledger* often has been called "the first School of Journalism." That distinction resulted from the fact that the late Colonel R. M. White, editor and publisher of the *Mexico Ledger*, turned out so many capable reporters. Often when St. Louis newspapers needed a news man they first called Colonel White to see what he had available. They knew he was a strict and painstaking taskmaster. He insisted on the coverage of details that clung strictly to the facts. His students developed a knowledge of reporting that covered every phase of the news field. He didn't train any specialists. As a result, the *Ledger* is credited

with having the most distinguished alumni of any small newspaper in the country. On November 22, 1940, at their own suggestion, the *Ledger's* alumni gathered in Mexico from all sections of the nation and organized an alumni association. Mary Margaret McBride, the nationally popular woman writer and commentator, and one-time *Ledger* city editor, attended and was elected alumni president.

Isaac Gershman, general manager of the City News Bureau of Chicago, at the February, 1943, meeting of the Inland Daily Press Association in that city, gave an illuminating picture of the man-power situation in terms of his agency. The Bureau is owned co-öperatively by the Chicago newspapers. It has a dual purpose—as a press association for gathering news and as a training school for reporters. When a Chicago newspaper needs a replacement it calls upon the Bureau to fill it. There is no competition. If a newspaper wants one of the Bureau's men, it takes him. Until recently, the staff of about forty-eight was largely composed of young men, normally about thirty per cent cubs. In speaking of his experience since the war began to make their man-power shortage critical, Mr. Gershman said in part:

"Since a little more than a year ago we have lost more than eighty men, a turnover of two hundred per cent. To one newspaper alone, we lost eleven men in a group. Six of them were trained men who had been with us from ten to fifteen years. Our member newspapers were losing them, too, but they were taking our men for replacements. At one point they had eighty per cent cubs and all their editors trembled in fear of libel suits. So we decided to take girls.

"Before the war we had from five to six hundred applications annually. Our staff was carefully selected . . . we spent from two to three years training these men before they were transferred to the Chicago newspapers. Out of this group we have produced one hundred and fifty famous publishers, magazine editors, foreign correspondents, playwrights, financial editors, and by-line reporters.

"We now try to do the job in four months, but we have reversed our training system. Formerly, we started a man on a police beat and he was then advanced to federal, city hall, rewrite, and finally to a desk job. In our new system, while we start them at the bottom, we also give them the overall picture. For one or two days a week, we send them on important beats with an experienced reporter, so that the novice can get a complete picture of just how news is gathered. In that way, we have hastened our training by one-third."

Mr. Gershman tells of starting, shortly after Pearl Harbor, with six girls as an experiment; and after a year they had twenty-eight

and found, as many of us have, that a girl can do a man's job if she is trained and treated just like a man. He has them doing police, desk work, rewrite, Federal building and County building. They do expository writing equally as well as a man, and are as accurate as financial writers. They cover County board meetings, the City Hall and Council affairs. Mr. Gershman says:

"We've also learned a lot about how not to handle women. We had three hundred applications, but fifty per cent of them proved to be worthless. Some were girls who had written a poem while in high school, or had a wishful desire to be the Hollywood type of newspaper reporter. We got rid of those who did not work well in a group, those having petty jealousies, and those demanding unwarranted promotions or privileges. We straightened out some, and we fired others. We found that in hiring girls we must be twice as careful in selecting them as we would in selecting a man. We developed a system by which we send prospective reporters out on test stories and send with them an experienced reporter. This reporter makes a written report on the girl's attitude, personality, and ability to adapt herself, both to people and to working conditions.

"However, we found that too many girls create a bottleneck, as we cannot shift them to certain night positions; and therefore men who should be promoted cannot be moved up. So again we faced the problem of needing men.

"To our surprise, we found a pool of men available. In the last two months, we have hired nine men of the type that we formerly would not have taken and did not even think were available. (1) They are made up of former newspaper men who had been in advertising, magazine, trade papers, publicity, radio, or non-essential industries, and have been thrown out of jobs by staff curtailments. (2) We found scores of college journalism students who, when they graduated ten or twelve years ago, could not get into newspaper work and went into other kinds of business. Now they want newspaper jobs. (3) We have found the army is turning back 4-F's, too. Men who were formerly in newspaper work but have slight disabilities, such as a heart murmur, sinus conditions or flat feet. (4) This group is girls, many of them with college degrees, who have been in allied newspaper fields working as proof readers, copy readers or business women handling house organs. (5) Our last group came from the Chicago newspapers themselves. We have taken men and women out of various departments which have been reduced on the Chicago newspapers. Some were clerks, others were from the promotion department, or secretaries or even from the travel bureau.

After they have been developed, we return them to their former employers as capable newspaper reporters."

The experience of the City News Bureau in Chicago parallels that of many other employers. The small trickle of men applicants today, as against the former flood, has necessitated a change in hiring practices. Mr. Gershman found that nearly every applicant was a potential newspaper man and that, while they were not of the caliber formerly selected, they could be developed when more time was devoted to their training. He has developed a rewrite system which permits cubs to write small stories; also he sends them on some of the regular news beats to write test stories.

In Missouri, the State Department of Public Schools recently launched an emergency program under which high school boys and girls may devote as much as half of their school time to learning the printing trade by participating in the production of the home town newspaper. Under this arrangement high school boys and girls who demonstrate sufficient interest and aptitude may be employed in the mechanical department of the home town newspaper for as much as one-half of each working day and receive school credit. Success of the arrangement hinges upon the ability of the publisher and the high school principal to coöperate in the training program necessary to make the plan acceptable as an educational activity. The program is expected to serve two purposes: (1) to make available to the student valuable training in the graphic arts industry; (2) to give the newspaper publisher a source of labor which will become more valuable as the student progresses in the training program.

Students under the program pursue a definite course of study under the supervision of their high school teachers and perform the laboratory part of the course in the newspaper plant, under the direction of the foreman or publisher, as an active participant in the regular mechanical production of the shop. The student is paid at a rate in keeping with conditions and his value to the newspaper. Two courses of study are offered, one for machine operators and another providing training in hand composition, make-up, and press work.

The development of the program depends mainly upon whether or not a sufficient number of Missouri publishers are sufficiently interested to justify the effort. The Missouri Press Association is coöperating with the State Department of Public Schools in the matter.

As this article is being written, the man-power shortage is reaching its most critical period for the small town weekly newspapers. Traditionally understaffed, the weekly paper is usually edited and printed in such a manner that the worker has both hands immersed

in all departments during the course of publishing a single issue. From a reliable source I am informed that of the approximately five hundred weekly newspapers in Missouri, a large number are man-and-wife publications, or even one-man newspapers. Many of these papers have been marginal projects for years, netting the owner-operator only a small income. Some papers have changed hands recently because the former owners preferred dollar-an-hour wages in defense plants to bare subsistence incomes as newspaper proprietors. My informant tells me that for the same reason other papers have suspended publication.

However, there is no other group in the United States with more rugged individualism and initiative than the editors and publishers of the small country weeklies. Both frequently have the responsibilities of the reporter, the ad man, the job printer, the make-up man, and the "devil.'" Besides, there are a myriad of extra-curricular civic responsibilities they willingly assume—all of which tends to make them about the busiest and most helpful men in the community.

Not all of the small newspapers are going to be closed and it is doubtful if many will be starved out; most of them can be kept running on a minimum of cash income. Many are owned by elderly men who have training in every essential of issuing a one-man newspaper. It would be difficult for them to find or to qualify for other work. Even if they could change occupations, many of them have that indomitable courage which will enable them to "go to press" in spite of almost insurmountable handicaps.

That Missouri newspaper men are aware of this threat to their business is indicated by their interest in recent legislation which would permit post-war reinstatement with full legal rights of newspapers suspended for the duration.

It is the small newspaper, with modest revenue and comparatively high operating costs, that is suffering the most. The small town publisher who can issue his own newspaper is in much better position than the small town publisher who requires several men to carry on in the mechanical departments. With reference to the latter publishers, the pressure comes from various directions. The War Department has commandeered almost all of their able-bodied men of military age. In some metropolitan fields, the newspapers are constantly recruiting the better qualified workers of the country newspapers. Defense plants also are contributing to this shortage.

Today the small town newspapers are being forced to depend upon old men well past their prime, upon women, and a few 3A and 4F men of military age. The Superintendent of the Missouri School

for the Deaf recently pointed out that all of the graduates from the printing trade division of his institution are profitably employed. Several years ago, these deaf mutes found it extremely difficult to find employment.

In the small weekly newspaper towns consideration is now being given to the pooling of plant equipment and labor to produce several newspapers from one mechanical plant and staff. So far, not much of this has been done. In Cooper County, Missouri, a movement is under way in which several publishers will pool their personal labor and print their newspapers in the same shop, using much of the same news and features in the several coöperating papers. Instead of having one newspaper publish another in the vicinity, as has been the custom for purposes of economy in certain small communities, the idea is to be expanded on a coöperative basis for the duration at least. In another section of Missouri, one county seat weekly recently produced practically all of the composition for its own publication and two others nearby. Because of an emergency in which the publisher of a nearby weekly was called away, the owner of the county seat newspaper, with the help of his daughter, did all the composition for his own and two other newspapers.

More and more high school students are being brought into these small newspaper offices at every opportunity. They develop rapidly. They are interested, and interest is the magnet which brings them across the threshold of a newspaper plant.

In gathering material for this article, it was interesting and encouraging to note the number of instances in which preachers, many of whom had been small town printers, are assisting in the publishing of newspapers. In three Missouri cases which have come to my attention the pastors of local churches assisted at the printing offices. In another town, the ministers have been of invaluable help in assisting the publisher with the collection of news.

Recently in our own office we had a woman caller who was a practical printer and had at one time published a weekly newspaper in a small town. She had not been active in the work for a number of years, but learning of the shortage, called to make her assistance available whenever needed. Her availability hitherto had been unknown to us. This was not an unusual episode. A number of small publishers in Missouri have discovered experienced and capable workers whose existence they did not suspect until news of the critical shortage of man-power was broadcast over the neighborhood.

Small town newspapers will be able to meet some of the man-power shortage by methods not practical for the metropolitan press.

Publishers of weeklies and moderate-sized dailies have various news sources that are eagerly awaiting the opportunity to get into print. One of the old-timers in country journalism has recommended the local clergy as a means of reportorial assistance. These small town preachers "get around," and most of them can write news items that require very little in the way of rewrite. Even if they do, at frequent intervals, indulge in a bit of press agentry for their churches, it should be remembered that most church members are the publisher's subscribers.

The local banks are clearing houses for considerable news of a commercial nature and in nearly every small city bank there is someone who has an ambition to see his words in print. About the only preliminary work necessary to tap the news source at the bank is to convince the president that much of the news he can supply will benefit the community insofar as it will show commercial activity. Many local physicians are happy to report births, deaths, and sickness; there is nothing unethical about it, and if they can be led into the habit of telephoning these items to the newspaper office, considerable time and footwork can be released for other assignments.

From the advertising angle, there is hardly a small town newspaper that hasn't someone in the mechanical department capable of writing and making attractive layouts of advertisements. One newspaper the writer knows has a printer apprentice who is so interested in advertising he prepares copy at night in his home and takes time off the next day to go out and sell it. The publisher of this newspaper has convinced himself that the apprentice can sell copy where the publisher can't sell space. Stated in another way, there are merchants who will take active interest in a piece of advertising copy prepared for them, when they would have no interest whatever in contracting for white space to be filled with copy they themselves would be required to prepare.

If this man-power shortage contributes to a thorough research for methods of bringing about more efficiency from the employes of the small newspaper, it will have its profitable compensations. It would be an unjust indictment to say that all small town publishers are lazy—both mentally and physically—but the percentage of those who are fully alert does not run exceedingly high. It is not extravagant to say that among the employees in the small town papers are many who could assume added responsibilities. The publisher who alertly and carefully analyzes his staff will come to the conclusion that many man hours can be added without any payroll additions.

Mr. Abels was born in Kansas and graduated from the School of Journalism at the University of Kansas. His newspaper experience has been chiefly in that state. He is now publisher of the *Lawrence Outlook* and the *Eudora News*. He is serving his fourth term in the Kansas Legislature this winter. He was the 1942-43 president of the National Editorial Association.

THE SMALL-TOWN PAPER

By EDWIN F. ABELS

Of necessity, the daily and weekly newspapers of the smaller towns of America—the bulwark of our democracy—have increasingly yielded to war pressures since Pearl Harbor.

A great many small daily papers have either suspended, merged with other papers, or limited their frequency of publication. Hundreds of weekly papers have stopped publication entirely. Drafting of skilled workers for the armed forces, the loss of workmen lured by high wages at the war plants, and the proselyting of both front and back office workers by the big city dailies are the main reasons for the rapidly growing list of casualties among the small-town papers.

Undoubtedly many papers that have suspended will never resume publication. The traditional American functioning of government will be weakened in proportion to the number of papers that are permanently discontinued. Congress recently was made aware of this fact when Senator Bankhead of Alabama, and others, paid tribute to the small-town newspapers.

However, the war has had some favorable effects upon the small-town dailies and weeklies. Those papers that have survived are better edited, more carefully made up, and better printed. Smaller revenues have made it necessary to cut enough corners to keep the plant going. This has meant a more careful checking on subscription collections and more attention to want-ads and the other small sources of revenue that the average paper does not care to bother with in normal times.

Many small papers during the past year have literally operated on a hand-to-mouth basis. But that has in no way interfered with the war publisher's use of his paper to do his full duty for his country. Not an issue is published that does not carry in its columns the news of the boys in the armed services—the sort of news that has contributed substantially to Army morale. The problems and procedures of the draft and rationing boards, the activities of the rent control agency, the victory garden effort, the food production appeal, the Red Cross work, the drive for the sale of war bonds—all of these are detailed in every small-town paper in America, day after day, week after week.

An abnormal demand for space on the part of subscribers who are taking part in the war effort has forced a much closer editing of the average small-town paper. Country correspondence has been condensed to make more room for news of Red Cross activities. The long and detailed description of the bride's costume has given way to coverage of point rationing and victory garden cultivation. Many editors have found that they can save ten per cent of their newsprint and have more room for local news than ever before.

Culled from the flood of government material have come enough live stories to tax the ingenuity of any publisher. It is material in which the home folk are interested, information that is valuable in building and holding civilian morale. Stories that deal with the draft, rationing, and all of the activities that are being carried on in every community by committees made up of readers of the small-town paper in America cannot be neglected.

The small-town editor never allows changing conditions to interfere with his duty to his country. Throughout all of his career he has advocated good citizenship. He has presented it to his readers from dozens of viewpoints through the years prior to the outbreak of the war. It is only natural that when he finds his country in a crisis he gives his all to help.

The drive for scrap iron was a united effort on the part of all newspapers both large and small. There was plenty of publicity in all papers, but the publisher of the small-town paper did not stop when he ran a few stories. In literally thousands of communities, he perfected the organization that actually went out on the farms and down the back alleys to collect the scrap. In the bond sales throughout the nation, the publisher again furnished leadership as well as space. It is true that he and his editor bought few war bonds of their own, but that did not keep them from giving their time, their energy, and their cooperation to the work they were called upon to do for their country.

Through this swiftly moving time of change the publishers have not been unmindful of the future. Attendance at press association meetings in every section of the country has been breaking all records. The publishers are determined to find ways of carrying on through this trying time and to plan for the future. Publishers throughout the nation have demanded more from their national association than ever before; requests have come in for all types of services. The small-town publishers want information about new ways to make money—they want short cuts to eliminate expense in order to balance falling revenue. They want a type of advertising that will bring to the country publisher his full share of the national advertising dollar when this war is won. They are demanding a service in Washington to warn and protect them from unjust and unfair rulings that might further handicap their business.

The pressure of the times has awakened in the small-town publisher a new degree of realization of power. The government official does not fear the metropolitan dailies with their huge circulations. He knows that their readers are indifferent or a part of a big city political machine that can be "handled." But he does fear the compelling influence that the small-town editor has with his relatively small number of readers because, woven into his subscription list, there is friendship, confidence, and intimacy—something that cannot be duplicated by any other medium or in any other manner. It is the close contact between the editor of the small-town paper and his subscribers that makes the small newspaper a powerful influence.

In every typically American community the editor of the paper attends all community meetings. He plays an important part in the civic life of his town. He is either the leader in the territory he serves or closely associated with those who do the leading. His messages in the news stories and editorial columns of his paper are accepted at face value by subscribers who trust him implicitly. When he says that scrap iron is needed or that more bonds must be sold, there is no question about the matter.

Realization of this power will have a great influence during the closing days of the war and the peace that follows. Every successful campaign in which the small-town paper participates will add to the editor's skill in using his paper more effectively. The influence lost because of suspended papers will be regained in better and more effective journalism.

The author of this article was born in Michigan and has two degrees from the University of Michigan, as well as an honorary degree from Wayne University. After several years of service on the *Detroit News,* he joined the faculty of the School of Journalism at the University of Washington, later becoming head of that School. In 1917 he returned to the *Detroit News,* of whose editorial staff he has been a member ever since. He was formerly editor of the *Quill* and national president of Sigma Delta Chi.

REPORTING AND THE BY-LINE

By LEE A. WHITE

"The *Times,*" said one old gentleman to another, as they waggled their clubs over an English golf course, "isn't the paper it used to be."

"No," admitted his companion dryly, "and it never was."

There is counsel of caution in that remark, but hardly enough to scare one away from useful generalities.

For two and a half centuries the American newspaper has been undergoing change, sometimes at a sluggish, at other times at a highly accelerated pace. The conclusions of those who have pondered each perceptible trend have not always been complimentary—indeed, often the very opposite. But it would be difficult to establish that the developments were, on the whole, other than for good.

A conspicuous upthrust from the plain of accomplishment has been the now traditional objectivity of our reporting of news; and this has differentiated the press of the United States from that of most countries. It has given America *news*papers, as distinguished from *views*papers, even in those periods when personal leadership in the press was marked.

Horace Greeley, while in London in 1851, was invited to appear before a committee of the House of Commons, and was interrogated at some length with respect to the newspapers on this side of the Atlantic.

"Having observed both countries," he was asked, "can you state whether the press has greater influence on public opinion in the United States than in England, or the reverse?"

"I think it has more influence with us," he said. "I do not know that any class is despotically governed by it, but the influence is more universal. Everyone reads it and talks about it with us, and more weight is laid upon intelligence than on editorials; the paper which brings the quickest news is the one looked to."

"The leading article [i.e., editorial] has not so much influence as it has in England?"

"No; the telegraphic dispatch is the great point," said Greeley.

Seventy-five years later, at the conference of the Press Congress of the World in Geneva, Stéphane Lauzanne, editor of *Le Matin* of Paris, was saying:

"Maybe in French journalism—and also in British journalism—the difference between the idea and the news is not sufficiently marked. Perhaps commentary is too mixed up with fact. For my part, I would willingly say, in this respect, that the model of practice is the *New York Times*. Nowhere is the fact separated with a more jealous care from the commentary. On one side there is the information, namely, nearly the whole of the paper; on the other side there is the judgment—that is to say, one single page, the page of the editorial. . . . Apart from the editorial page, the readers of all parties, all opinions, and all creeds can read the paper without feeling the least vexation, the slightest shock. They are presented with the materials; they are free to dispose of them in their consciences as they please."

It would be easier to theorize than to prove just what part this phenomenon has played in the development of the character of our democracy. If an important one, then the more reason for anxiety, for there are unmistakable signs of departure from principle and practice.

There is little room for debate with respect to the proper function of the newspaper, by American standards. From its inception, it has felt under obligation to advise as well as to inform; and for most of its life, it has chosen also to provide entertainment. There is no pressure for the abandonment of any of these three services to the reader, whatever may be the qualitative or quantitative analyses. Least of all is any objection upon the part of the newspaper's clientele in evidence. The perplexing problem is the disposition of the matter that the publisher is willing to print and the subscriber desires to read.

Traditionally, opinion belongs on the editorial page, and should be clearly identifiable as such. That is what made a ready response easy when, in 1940, statistical evidence was adduced to indicate that the power of the press had been dissipated, if indeed it had not vanished. Against the advice of an overwhelming percentage of the editors of

the country, the people had swept Franklin D. Roosevelt into office for an unprecedented third term.

"But," said the defense, "the voters of America have never cast their ballots at the dictation of editorial writers. They were guided by their own experiences, their observations, hearsay, and the knowledge they had gleaned from the news columns of the press. Eight years of factual information, or what passed as such, outweighed all the reasoned protests and dolorous tirades of the opposition. The election was a vindication of the power of the printed word; of the major function of the newspaper, which is to inform rather than to advise."

If so, then despite a growing tendency to obliterate the line between fact and opinion, the public is still able to distinguish the one from the other. But it is the inclination of much of the press to evade that demarcation which gives rise to anxiety, and to a search for preventives. The encroachments of opinion upon the news columns have been both numerous and insidious; they are becoming bold to the point of brazenness. The trend is, indeed, so far advanced that the very term "news columns" has become something of a misnomer. The liberties accorded the commentators upon literature, music, art, drama, and latterly the cinema, have passed to foreign, Washington and state capital correspondents, to city hall reporters, to sports writers, to the editors of women's pages and society columns, and to whom not?

No one expects the crusading newspaper to hew to the line. As such, it has deliberately set itself apart, and sought a public to whom its policies are acceptable. Whether out of the depth of its convictions or its shrewdness, it inclines to put the achievement of its aims above the discovery and disclosure of all pertinent facts. The results are inevitably a biased approach to the sources of information, and prejudice in the selection, organization and presentation of its campaign materials.

Take *PM,* for example. Although some might protest that it has more of the characteristics of a doctrinaire publication than of a newspaper, still it has made a fresh approach to the problem of coverage of several neglected news areas, involving conspicuously our racial minorities, labor, and the consumer. To the more cynical critics of the press, it held out at first a very high hope of objectivity since, being generously financed and unconcerned with advertising, it had no other problem than to produce a readable and serviceable daily and deliver it to whatever public it could interest.

The heading of *PM's* second page, which is the equivalent of the editorial page of the traditional press, is "Opinion." The plain im-

plication is that here is a segregation of such views as the publication entertains, and that what is to be found elsewhere is wholly (or ought we to say dominantly?) factual. Actually, throughout the paper major articles and minor, whether signed or unsigned, are freighted with opinions. At times, these opinions are flat-footedly stated; at other times they subtly extrude themselves from behind innocent words and phrases. Even the scattering of abbreviated news service dispatches commonly appear under captions that slant toward the editor's office. To approve *PM's* practices, and to accept its presentation of information, the reader must be a partisan; he must share the convictions of the paper. For there is no heterogeneity of opinions, such as might characterize a newspaper whose leaderless staff ran hog-wild in its columns; *PM's* bent is discernible to the least critical of readers.

Were such newspapers predominant, we should have a situation more European than American, in which people derived their information *in toto* or in substantial part from publications harmonious with their own opinions and prejudices. Granted that the public is not, and never has been, dependent on the newspaper press for all of its information, and that it is not precluded from reading and weighing two opposed opinions and arriving at a third. Nevertheless, the prevalence of a policy-laden press would signify the division of the public into partisan classes (or masses)—an unhealthy separation of the elements of a democracy, leaving each insufficiently aware of the thought-processes of the other, and oblivious to the biased nature of the information on which its own opinions rest.

"Sacred cows" are to be found in the pastures of many a newspaper, and a little or a lot of crusading is done, on occasion, by a considerable percentage; but on the whole it is the apparent intention of most newspapers to adhere to tradition and maintain the integrity of the news columns. The trouble is that however willing the spirit, the flesh still reveals its weakness. Opinion insinuates itself into reportorial copy, despite admonition and rebuke. It may result from unconscious obedience to impulse or emotion, from indiscreet imitation of example, or from design; the results are much the same. It carries over, too often, into the headline, and even influences make-up and display. The upshot is the infusion of what purport to be factual news pages with material that is distinctly in the realm of ideas, so that the reader ceases to be able to say, with clear comprehension of the difference, "This I know on good authority," and "This I have been led to believe."

Let's not absolve the reader from all blame. He is both curious and inquisitive, but also a bit lazy. No doubt he wants more than the

news and its background; more than facts and their elucidation. He may have notions of his own and arguments to sustain them; yet he wants and seeks to know the conclusions reached by others. He has a right to opinion as well as information, but unfortunately is not averse to arriving at one without the other. He asks advice, guidance, not usually because he lacks confidence in his own judgment, but because the shortcut is a pleasant route to his destination. Unabashed by lack of knowledge, but perhaps troubled by the arduousness and complexity of the task of acquiring it, he turns to those in whom he has confidence. He may put his trust in a newspaper's opinions, as voiced by editorial writers, or in those of a staff or syndicated commentator. In either event, he will probably rest his faith on that adviser who is most like-minded.

Such a frame of mind will never discourage a circulation manager; nor will it offend any editor who is willing, within the bounds of reason and decency, to respond to public demand. If opinions are wanted, as well as facts, they will be supplied, and in sufficient variety to meet the diverse tastes and fancies of his readers. This is legitimate enterprise which, in itself, need not impair the character and quality of the services the newspaper offers. Yet perhaps it should be listed among the factors leading to difficulty.

The editorial page, as the newspaper's repository of opinion, long ago developed spatial problems. Despite its compactness, in which it rivaled the market page (as it did also in dullness of aspect), it was still unequal to the torrent of editorials, paragraphs, columns, cartoons and public-letter-box contributions that crossed the desk of the editor each day. When, in recent years, he found himself facing several new and persistent trends, his perplexities were multiplied. Typographical experts began the struggle to open up and brighten the page; syndicates released a spate of opinion features whose increasing popularity was in evidence; and thoughtful journalists set up a clamor for "interpretative reporting" to offset the inadequacies of both editorials and news stories. The inevitable result was a bursting of embankments, and the overflow of opinion into news pages where, previously, critics, political commentators and advisers of the beleaguered and the distressed had been the more conspicuous aliens. The effort to maintain the objectivity of news-writing and -handling became a losing one.

The stream of thought upon this question has been somewhat turbid at times; and it cannot be said to have been clarified by most of those who argued the need of "interpretative reporting." Perhaps the fault lies in the term itself. It suggests a special license to escape the restraints traditionally imposed upon the reporter, and to acquire some

of the liberties that supposedly have been the exclusive possession of the editorial writer or commentator. Unfortunately, *interpret* has two meanings: (1) to explain or tell the meaning of; translate; elucidate; and (2) to construe in the light of individual belief, judgment, or interest. The first is a proper reportorial function; the second is definitely within the province of the editorial writer.

It would be well to reject the thought that to write anything in a news article which could be printed under the masthead is to violate the canons of journalism. That is not true. Editorial writers have long found descriptive and expository writing, even occasionally narrative, to be acceptable deviations from the argumentative routine. It is the venturing of opinion, in articles which purport or are reasonably assumed to be objective and factual, which is under interdict. The question, then, is whether the average newspaper specialist, if given the responsibility of explanation and elucidation—of providing a needed background for the spot news which comes under his hand—can restrain the impulse to expound a theory or argue a point, for the purpose of directing the minds and formulating the opinions of his readers. And, it is important to add, whether equal restraint can be exercised by the specialist's neighbors in the news columns, who are sure to fall under the influence of his example.

Such misgivings are not groundless. Many of those who are still governed by the scruples of a distant youth, and so are disposed to treat news as news, can see no harm in tossing off a weekly or more frequent column of chit-chat in their field; reminiscent, perhaps; a bit of background or by-the-way comment—under a by-line, to be sure! It can be slipped into a corner of the departmental page as unaffectedly as the grapevine and miscellany of another day. But presently such columns are laden with opinions so positive and so sweeping as to surprise and embarrass the less precipitate editor-in-chief, and commit the newspaper. How else shall one explain the *Miami Herald's* real estate editor who (of all persons!) runs the gamut in his Sunday column from poetic disquisitions upon "God-favored, fruitful Florida" to diatribes against Herr Schicklgruber?

It is hardly to be wondered at that the public, inured though it is to the vagaries of newspaper folk, should attribute to a newspaper every policy or opinion that finds expression in its pages, whether under the signature of David Lawrence or Ernest Lindley, Westbrook Pegler or Dorothy Thompson, Bugs Baer or Walter Lippmann, to say nothing of less conspicuous syndicated writers or members of the staff.

Capitulation to the desire, the expectation, the demand of writers for by-lines has been easiest for the newspaper executive who has not

given too much thought to the social and professional implications. For him it has sufficed that "everyone is doing it"; that it is more comfortable to yield than to resist; and that certain advantages accrue to the employer as well as the employed. But some of the arguments that are adduced (perhaps in retrospect) may be challenged.

The wish to be identified with one's accomplishments is both natural and innocent. It assumes the proportions of a moral right among those who have dedicated themselves to literature and the arts, and to whom the newspaper man feels himself akin. Nor is it strange that a reporter who has expended a deal of time, energy and talent in building up the reputations of those who figure in the day's news should be wistful for his own place in the sun.

Some of his fellow occupants of the newspaper pages—the authors of political cartoons and comic strips, syndicated features and fiction, humorous and serious columns, poetry and casual verse, essays and critiques, Washington and foreign correspondence—have always been accorded this form of recognition. It has long been a sugar-plum for the scintillant and temperamental veteran on special assignment. And latterly, it has been bestowed upon no end of writers, presumed authorities in their fields though sometimes still serving their novitiate—as for example in the sports, financial, and women's departments.

Why, then, deny public credit to the ruck of the city room, without whose spot news stories the newspaper would lack reason for existence? Why withhold this simple form of acknowledgment, with its tendency to stimulate high enterprise in news-gathering and pride in the craftsmanship of writing? Why be niggardly with a form of compensation so intangible and inexpensive, yet one which somewhat offsets the temptations of other occupations?

There are, of course, technical problems to be faced. By-lines are often, nowadays, misapplied, in that they appear over stories that are not the output of the single individual accredited, but rather the result of the unified efforts of the assigning executive, perhaps more than one reporter, a rewrite man or two, and a copyreader. In fact not infrequently the person whose name is used is guiltless of the composition of the story, if not incapable of it. There is, of course, nothing to prohibit the use of more than one person's name; nor is the limit two. But there is an antipathy to be overcome, despite sanctioning precedent in all fields of literature. A Pulitzer prize for reporting was awarded in 1932 to five men who contributed to the development of a single story, which ran under the names of all five, and of the illustrator.

But since the conferring of by-lines seems to follow no general and understandable rule, it is not clear why the arguments in favor of their

application to stories in the news columns do not justify giving them to everyone on the staff, and to each as many on any day as he may have pieces in the paper. If an accolade for quality, why not for quantity? If for investigative ability, and a facile style, why not for durable legs and nimble fingers? Although some publications have approximated this liberal policy, there will be others to protest against such prodigality and ask for a rational but moderate scheme. Well, why not expend the paper's stock of by-lines most freely on callow reporters, since they may be presumed to need stimulation and encouragment more than the veterans whose reputations are already established? These are *not* ridiculous suggestions—leastwise, not more ridiculous than the practices they satirize.

The indiscriminate awarding of by-lines has tended so to cheapen them as to make it debatable whether they are productive of improved reporting. Certainly the claim is not susceptible of proof. The improvement in the quality of writing which characterizes the modern newspaper should not be unrelated to the superior educational opportunities the present generation of journalists have enjoyed. But if comparison were made between two newspapers of today, only one of which made free with signatures, it is doubtful whether the proponent of by-lines could find evidence to sustain his point, either with respect to enterprise or literary style.

In conservative practice, if we may judge by newspaper classics, the granting of by-lines has *followed* recognition of a reporter's skill, rather than preceding it; and many of the best examples have not been identified as to authorship until after publication, if at all. Other incentives than public attention, then, must have actuated the writers; and these would not be far to seek. First, let us hope, would be the satisfaction any worthwhile reporter derives from a task well done; and second, the approbation of superiors and colleagues, to whom a good story is never anonymous. Many a star has gleamed from behind a pen name, and lost nothing of merit because of the concealment of his real identity from his readers; though this is more characteristic of European than American journalism. So long as much of the best writing in American newspapers continues to be anonymous, the lavish use of by-lines will not be accepted as an important stimulus to endeavor.

A case can, in fact, be made *against* the by-line as a detrimental influence upon workmanship. Initially the tendency is to employ it as a merited award, but too frequently it becomes a sop to vanity; such vanity, indeed, that those who have "tasted blood" are prone to write their own by-lines before beginning their stories; and that comes close

to the ultimate in brashness. There follows a natural courting of the praise of colleagues and lay readers, which induces self-consciousness in style. But there are too few who have the capacity to discriminate between good writing and bad. They do not constitute a satisfying audience. So the steps are taken that lead a once scrupulous reporter to lily-gilding; to the sacrifice of accuracy for the sake of such acclaim as may come from the invention of a "tag-line" or the fictional adornment of the essential facts of a story. As the ego of the writer is magnified, there is a departure from objectivity, and a venturing of ideas that move out of the area of the explanatory, beyond the interpretative, into the argumentative. From that point, there are but two places for the writer to go: into a "colyum" or onto the editorial page. (The choice, obviously, is the former, since traditions of anonymity still cling to editorial writing, and the columnist is freer from the restraints of those who determine the policies of the newspaper.) The process of self-exploitation is now fairly complete. The price—a good reporter; and an injury done to the press, as an institution, and thus to society!

As has been hinted, the newspaper executive has not wholly ignored the selfish interests of the newspaper in dispensing favors, nor has he been wholly capricious. But has he gained his end?

Few would question that a by-line is warranted at any time when the identity of the writer adds perceptibly to the validity of the story. Under such circumstances, readers are served and the newspaper is strengthened in its appeal. But how often is it the case? Excepting in articles supplying background, interpreting facts and venturing opinions, it is doubtful whether the name of the writer contributes to the authoritative quality of skilled reporting, such as is to be expected of experienced members of the staff. Reporters are much more likely to take on by reflection the character of a long-established newspaper than they are to fortify its reputation as a dependable source of information. Their own professional, if not personal, reputations are in most instances built up by their newspapers; and that will doubtless be equally true of their successors. It is a hazard of the publishing business that an individual may more quickly jeopardize than enhance a newspaper's good standing.

More immediately purposeful is the desire to give prestige to a writer, through the bestowal of by-lines, which will be to the advantage of the newspaper in the tapping of news sources. The theory is that his inquiries, his demands, will be met more respectfully. But a reporter should not need personal prestige to get news. His newspaper should and does demand and command information for its readers, regardless of whom its city editor may choose to assign to a beat or a

story. It is the responsibility of the newspaper to gain and to maintain respect and influence, if not ascendancy; and it is obligated to make such changes in staff as are necessary to that end. It ought never to be at the mercy of those who strive (and not always by creditable means) to get a corner on news, or to anchor themselves in ports to their liking.

And there should be clear and continuing comprehension of the distinction between personal and institutional prestige and power. In the keen competition for news, a reporter encounters more often than is agreeable those who would play favorites among newspapers, or who manifest a disposition to withhold information which is of public interest and import. Under such circumstances, when the battle of wits threatens to end in a stalemate, the application of pressure is sometimes resorted to. If it is to be employed, the power of coercion or reprisal certainly should not be that of the reporter as an individual, but of the newspaper which he represents; for with this power goes a very serious and perhaps adjudicable responsibility that cannot be delegated. By the same token the reporter, who has nothing to offer that is his own in return for anything he may keep, should be free from temptation to employ *quid pro quo* tactics to gain advantage in the rivalry for stories. The less personalized he is, the less the likelihood of such breaches of ethics.

Those employers who have thought of the by-line in their own self-interest must, of course, make their peace with their own consciences. Viewed as a form of compensation, in lieu of something more tangible in the pay envelope, no doubt it makes it easier to attract promising young writers to the profession, and to hold those older persons who possess well-developed skills. (That is seemingly the case with radio, where with even less justification the reader of advertising blurbs and canned news is identified as though he were an oracle.) A by-line may do more than furnish a substitute for advancement in position or pay. It may check the frustration of those who suffer from an author complex. It may palliate such grievous offenses as cutting a cherished passage from a story to meet exigencies of space, or imposing routine assignments on men who feel themselves above such tasks. All this is helpful, no doubt, to the executive; and he may feel, too, that the paper profits by revealing its enterprise when it prints special correspondence from afar, or exploits exclusive names. But if egos are inflated at the expense of objectivity in the presentation of news, and the foundations of the newspaper are thus weakened, the practice is indefensible. Some other means of meeting the personnel problems of the office must be found.

There can be little doubt that by-lines are with us to stay. As of old, they will be used to identify cartoonists, critics, commentators and such others (excepting, oddly, editorial writers) as are legitimately vested with the right of opinion. They will continue to appear on articles by those whose recognized authority in their fields of specialization gives weight to the printed word. They will be granted to reporters who render truly exceptional service through the news columns, though clinging sedulously to the factual. How far beyond this ought the practice to be permitted to go?

It is difficult to quarrel with those who contend that, rather than be too drastic in the restrictions upon by-lines, we should leave it to the copy desk and the policy-forming personnel to prevent abuses, and to bring back into proper relationship to the basic function of the newspaper a custom which has its helpful and justifiable aspects. But unfortunately, such an inclination on the part of copyreaders and executives is not much in evidence, else the problem would hardly have developed. On the contrary, there has been almost a rivalry among competitive newspapers to see which could wave the white flag of surrender to the tuft-hunters most vigorously.

There is grave need of standards, carefully formulated and firmly established by discriminating persons, whereby the use of signatures can be made less offensive, if not innocuous. In determining objectives, it would be commendable to eliminate any that are not socially defensible, since much more is at stake than the selfish interests of the employing newspaper and the writer. There might well be a limiting of authority and a fixing of responsibility for the bestowal of by-lines, in order to reduce the influence of whim and caprice and the frequency of inconsistencies. And for the sake of peace in the office, as well as the public weal, there should be avoidance of grudging assent in one case and favoritism in another. Obviously, these are matters of policy which will have to be determined by individual newspapers, each for itself. The decisions will be most readily accepted in those offices where identification with a fine newspaper product and a proud newspaper name is in itself the equivalent of a badge of honor and distinction.

But if a code could be written for the entire profession, and successfully applied, with respect to by-lines, it would dispose of but one factor influencing the decline in the objectivity of the *news*paper, however important; and so would not be in itself a solution of the basic problem. Indeed, there may be no solution, but certainly trends can be retarded. A bottle of benzine is an inadequate answer to an Army tank, but it has proved a help.

Once upon a time, newspapers which were confronted with the problem were wont to preface an opinion-laden article with a full-face or italic foreword: "The views here expressed," the editor's note might say, "are those of the writer, and do not necessarily express the opinion of this newspaper." Not a bad device, when such articles were infrequent, but in this heyday of idea-vendors, hardly to be considered. Too many pages of the paper would be sprinkled with these disclaimers—or should they be called petitions for indulgence?

A much simpler and more direct method would be to re-establish the segregation of matter which is fraught with opinion. If the editorial page is inadequate for the purpose, why limit the newspaper to one? If there is danger that what appears on the editorial page (or pages) will be interpreted as expressive of the convictions of the editor and publisher, why not make the distinction perfectly clear by differentiated headings? Why might not one page be devoted to "Opinions of this newspaper," and another to "Opinions of contributors"? Ventures in this direction, though without such precise labeling, are of record. "Opp. Ed." is a recent addition to journalistic jargon, coined to fit the case of those papers which have assembled syndicated comment, letters to the editor (which are often in the nature of lay editorials), and other departures from the factual, on the page opposite the editorial page. It is at once a concession to the appetite of the reader and a reaffirmation of an important principle.

The reader thus served would have before him, or at least available, the more or less authoritative pros and cons of any moot question. These he could set one against another, for purposes of evaluation. He could accept, reject or modify them. To allow him to test the cogency of the reasoning of editorial writer or contributor, he should have had access to the selfsame statements of fact that were the foundation of the opinions expressed. These facts should have appeared in news columns that are both comprehensive and objective.

We have not, as a nation or as a profession, given up our faith in the capacity of people to reach sound conclusions, if they are possessed of the pertinent facts, which are the raw materials of opinion. To provide these facts isn't a simple and unobstructed task, but it is one to which the conscientious newspaper man has committed himself. He might well approach it with a prayer for guidance—and conclude it with a prayer for forgiveness! For completely objective news, like absolute truth, is an ideal perhaps impossible of realization. The effort to attain it, however, is in itself worth while; and a close approximation of objectivity, as of accuracy, is an achievement which is rewarding to the press and of great benefit to the public.

Those who are experiencing, even vicariously, the agonies of this mad world must often wonder whether its fevers, its lusts, its bestialities, and its cruelties could have persisted so long had the people, everywhere, been permitted to know the truth concerning all that affected their lives and their fortunes. There are still a few lands where a degree of sanity survives, and this is one of them. Here, and no doubt elsewhere, the common man has not been unreasonable in what he has asked in order that he might be prepared to exercise with some degree of intelligence the responsibilities of his citizenship. He has sought the means to distinguish fact from theory, the false from the true. He has accepted the dictum that a well-informed citizen is well-implemented to achieve, and well-armed to defend democracy.

Unless we repudiate that thought, the press must tremble to contemplate its vast responsibility; yet with valor and determination go about its task. And if we fail? The public has very direct methods of expressing its exasperations, and attempting correctives; and should it ever reach the conclusion that it is a victim of tendentious reporting and editing, not only will the individual and offending newspaper suffer, but the press in general will find it increasingly difficult to maintain its precious heritage of freedom.

Associate Justice Frankfurter recently defined democracy as "the reign of reason," and observed that the popular will can "steer a proper course only when sufficiently enlightened to know what is the proper course to steer." If he was right—and who shall doubt it?—then it is the responsibility of the press to be chronometer and sextant to the helmsman.

Mr. Carter holds degrees from Washington and Lee University and Columbia University, and has been a member of the faculty of the Lee Memorial Journalism Foundation at the former institution. He has worked on Richmond, Virginia, and Greensboro, North Carolina, papers and for the AP in Richmond and New York. He is now associate editor of the Times-World Corporation, of Roanoke, Virginia, publisher of the *Times* and *World-News* in that city. He is chairman of the Southern Newspaper Publishers Association's Committee on Schools of Journalism and president of the National Council on Professional Education for Journalism. He holds a Distinguished Service Award presented by the Virginia Press Association for editorial writing during 1942.

PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION OBJECTIVES

By RICHARD POWELL CARTER

The National Council on Professional Education for Journalism is composed of representatives from the American Newspaper Publishers Association, the American Society of Newspaper Editors, the Southern Newspaper Publishers Association, the National Editorial Association, the Inland Daily Press Association, and the American Association of Schools and Departments of Journalism. As presently constituted, it was organized in 1939; but it is an outgrowth of a joint committee established in 1930 by major newspaper organizations and the schools.

The Council's purpose is to study the whole problem of education for journalism, and to improve constantly the standards of instruction. The war-time objective, which will carry over into the future, is to strengthen the already close ties existing between the schools of journalism and the newspapers—to coördinate the work of the schools with the emergency requirements of the newspaper profession.

College journalism is relatively new, as measured in terms of academic thought. Yet the idea was projected as long ago as 1869 by General Robert E. Lee, president of Washington College (now Washington and Lee University), after the War Between the States. The association of journalism instruction with academic notions and traditions was natural; and the expansion of our schools of journalism, especially during the past quarter century, was a logical development in the complete dedication of the American press to the American people.

Total war has dealt our schools and departments of journalism a series of severe blows. They were confronted at once by a sudden and ever-increasing demand for professionally trained men and women, while at the same time they had to maintain standards and teaching personnel. The problem was not a simple one of continuing journalism instruction, if only on a skeletonized basis; it was also a problem of adapting the schools' facilities to an alleviation of the man-power crisis facing newspapers as more and more men and women left their newspaper desks for the armed services and for civilian duties with the government.

It became apparent that the schools and the newspapers had to act quickly to meet a crisis in practical and academic journalism. With military requirements placing emphasis only upon the exact sciences, college journalism had no place in the government plans for conversion of our higher institutions of learning to war. However, college journalism had a place of its own—a unique position identical with the unique importance of our newspapers in the war effort. Newspapers urgently needed the aid of the schools of journalism, and the schools in turn needed the help of the newspapers.

Mutual appreciation of these needs and the difficulties of filling them already existed to a large extent. To give this full meaning, an emergency meeting of the National Council on Professional Education for Journalism was held in Chicago on January 8, 1943.

The magnitude of the crisis was illustrated for the Council by two reports on newspaper personnel conditions. One was a survey of daily newspaper personnel shortages, made by the Council in coöperation with seven press associations; it represented a fourteen-percent cross section of all English language dailies in the United States, and showed 2,187 vacancies with an anticipated need, within six months, of 4,169 additional replacements in the city rooms and in other departments. The other was a survey of the weekly field, made by the Medill School of Journalism in coöperation with the National Editorial Association; it represented only a 4.6 percent cross section of 11,925 weekly, semi-weekly and tri-weekly newspapers, but showed a present personnel shortage of 1,500 with an anticipated shortage of 2,035 more within six months.

The schools, of course, could not hope to fill all or even a great part of the needs for professionally educated men and women. Nevertheless, they could help, and were eager to do so. Our thirty-three ac-

Mr. Carter holds degrees from Washington and Lee University and Columbia University, and has been a member of the faculty of the Lee Memorial Journalism Foundation at the former institution. He has worked on Richmond, Virginia, and Greensboro, North Carolina, papers and for the AP in Richmond and New York. He is now associate editor of the Times-World Corporation, of Roanoke, Virginia, publisher of the *Times* and *World-News* in that city. He is chairman of the Southern Newspaper Publishers Association's Committee on Schools of Journalism and president of the National Council on Professional Education for Journalism. He holds a Distinguished Service Award presented by the Virginia Press Association for editorial writing during 1942.

PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION OBJECTIVES

By RICHARD POWELL CARTER

The National Council on Professional Education for Journalism is composed of representatives from the American Newspaper Publishers Association, the American Society of Newspaper Editors, the Southern Newspaper Publishers Association, the National Editorial Association, the Inland Daily Press Association, and the American Association of Schools and Departments of Journalism. As presently constituted, it was organized in 1939; but it is an outgrowth of a joint committee established in 1930 by major newspaper organizations and the schools.

The Council's purpose is to study the whole problem of education for journalism, and to improve constantly the standards of instruction. The war-time objective, which will carry over into the future, is to strengthen the already close ties existing between the schools of journalism and the newspapers—to coördinate the work of the schools with the emergency requirements of the newspaper profession.

College journalism is relatively new, as measured in terms of academic thought. Yet the idea was projected as long ago as 1869 by General Robert E. Lee, president of Washington College (now Washington and Lee University), after the War Between the States. The association of journalism instruction with academic notions and traditions was natural; and the expansion of our schools of journalism, especially during the past quarter century, was a logical development in the complete dedication of the American press to the American people.

Total war has dealt our schools and departments of journalism a series of severe blows. They were confronted at once by a sudden and ever-increasing demand for professionally trained men and women, while at the same time they had to maintain standards and teaching personnel. The problem was not a simple one of continuing journalism instruction, if only on a skeletonized basis; it was also a problem of adapting the schools' facilities to an alleviation of the man-power crisis facing newspapers as more and more men and women left their newspaper desks for the armed services and for civilian duties with the government.

It became apparent that the schools and the newspapers had to act quickly to meet a crisis in practical and academic journalism. With military requirements placing emphasis only upon the exact sciences, college journalism had no place in the government plans for conversion of our higher institutions of learning to war. However, college journalism had a place of its own—a unique position identical with the unique importance of our newspapers in the war effort. Newspapers urgently needed the aid of the schools of journalism, and the schools in turn needed the help of the newspapers.

Mutual appreciation of these needs and the difficulties of filling them already existed to a large extent. To give this full meaning, an emergency meeting of the National Council on Professional Education for Journalism was held in Chicago on January 8, 1943.

The magnitude of the crisis was illustrated for the Council by two reports on newspaper personnel conditions. One was a survey of daily newspaper personnel shortages, made by the Council in coöperation with seven press associations; it represented a fourteen-percent cross section of all English language dailies in the United States, and showed 2,187 vacancies with an anticipated need, within six months, of 4,169 additional replacements in the city rooms and in other departments. The other was a survey of the weekly field, made by the Medill School of Journalism in coöperation with the National Editorial Association; it represented only a 4.6 percent cross section of 11,925 weekly, semi-weekly and tri-weekly newspapers, but showed a present personnel shortage of 1,500 with an anticipated shortage of 2,035 more within six months.

The schools, of course, could not hope to fill all or even a great part of the needs for professionally educated men and women. Nevertheless, they could help, and were eager to do so. Our thirty-three ac-

credited schools of journalism in normal years provide approximately 1,450 replacements for newspapers, primarily in the city rooms.*

The Council therefore approved an accelerated program for schools of journalism, and suggested that "concentrated" courses be given to prepare certain qualified individuals for newspaper work in the shortest possible time. Caution was sounded against any procedure that might tend to lower standards of instruction or alter the regular degree programs.

These recommendations were carried out by the separate schools in accordance with their abilities. In turn, various press associations attempted to aid the accelerated programs by discovering and recommending students who may be fitted for such rapid orientation to newspaper work.

At a meeting held in connection with the ANPA sessions in New York in May, the Council adopted resolutions requesting the newspapers to aid in recruiting students for these "concentrated" emergency courses. According to the plan then approved, publishers forward the names of candidates for such instruction to the central office of the ANPA, which acts as a clearing house to transmit them to the schools.

Thus it is hoped to provide a replacement pool of man-power for the newspapers—though it will be largely woman-power. Even if the schools cannot hope to fill all the replacement needs of newspapers during this emergency, it is an established fact that they can turn out a considerable number of trained women, using both their regular instructional procedures and the accelerated courses which the majority of the institutions have developed.

It was the unqualified consensus of the Council, and of the deans and directors of journalism schools attending the meetings, that our schools have a serious responsibility in sustaining their programs.

Moreover, as positive indication of the determination to raise journalism instruction to higher and higher professional levels, the Council believes schools not qualified to offer professional programs should be discouraged from doing so. A proffered plan for "pre-journalism" teaching, drawn up before the war, was designed to eliminate or dras-

*A study based on reports from thirty-one Class A and 41 Class B schools of journalism showed the following distribution of journalism graduates over the five-year period 1934-1939: 39.22% went to daily newspapers, about three-fourths of these into city rooms, and the remainder into advertising; 15.20% to weekly newspapers; 4.62% to press associations (AP, UP, or INS); .64% to syndicates; 3.74% to business or trade publications; 3.75% to magazines; 5.57% into radio; 7.28% into publicity or public relations; 13.93% into advertising other than newspaper (industrial advertising departments, department store advertising, agencies); 6.05% entered fields not strictly journalistic.

tically revise all journalism instruction not up to professional standards; and this report has been delivered to college presidents, the Council feeling the "weeding out" process should be inaugurated despite the pressure of war. The objective is to restrict professional education in journalism, now and in peace-time, to those institutions prepared to offer just that. Unfortunately, there have been too many courses labelled journalism which should have been simply preparation for professional study of the subject. The war itself may bring about the elimination of non-professional instruction, so that in the future we shall have the ideal combination of adequate general education plus professional training on the campuses.

In a further attempt to implement the Council's work, a five-part factual report on newspaper personnel conditions was forwarded to War Manpower Commissioner Paul V. McNutt. Included were the surveys of personnel shortages, surveys of daily and weekly newspaper suspensions since January 1, 1942, and a report on potential replacements from the schools of journalism. The studies disclosed seventy-six daily newspaper suspensions, most of them under 5,000 circulation, and 354 weekly suspensions. The man-power factor was listed as a major reason for many suspensions.

In a brief foreword accompanying the Council's data for the Manpower Commissioner, it was observed: "The press has asked for no special privileges. It has contributed to the armed services a considerable percentage of its workers. But now the National Council believes the facts contained in these surveys should be brought to your attention lest this vital part of our war effort be seriously crippled."

THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

Born and educated in Indiana, Mr. Walters entered newspaper work in that state. In 1921 he left the *Indianapolis Star* and joined the *Milwaukee Journal;* he served the latter for seven years. In 1928 he joined the Cowles organization, becoming managing editor of the *Des Moines Register* and *Tribune* and, later, editor of the *Minneapolis Star-Journal* and *Tribune.* He is president of the Associated Press Managing Editors' Association and secretary of the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

THE NEW RESPECT FOR NEWSPAPERS

By BASIL L. WALTERS

Newspapers are losing their inferiority complex. By gosh and by heck, they've found they're men—not mice.

It's safe these days for a fellow to go to a newspaper meeting without danger of losing his faith in the future of his profession. The defensive days, the days of apology, are past. Discussion today is about the *advance.*

It is in time of great crisis that real ability—or lack of it—comes to light. In total war, the home front is as vital as the fighting front. Newspapers, whether published in the largest cities or the smallest hamlets, are today the leaders in their communities. The home front would fail without them, and that means America would lose the war.

Flexibility and practically instantaneous coverage of every home in America enable the newspapers to serve as a secretary to every reader.

Go into the kitchen of any home in America today and you will find on the wall the ration calendar of the week, the point charts and directions for salvage, all clipped from the local newspaper.

Go to any meeting of civic leaders in which bond drives, blood banks, war chests, victory gardens, or any other home front problems are being discussed, and you will find the newspaper, "the secretary of the community," represented. It is only through the newspaper that the decisions reached can be quickly distributed in printed form to every member of the community.

Go into any editor's office and you will find the recruiting officers

of the WACs and WAVES getting assistance in their drives for women to release men for the fighting fronts.

If a crisis develops in steel production because scrap metal is not coming in as fast as it should, you will find newspaper staffs taking the leadership in collecting the scrap because newspaper men know how to get things done quickly. They are the *minute men* of the *home front.*

The American people are conscious that their newspapers have followed a practice of victory through truth and have avoided misleading propaganda. For that reason, respect for, and reliance in, newspapers has never been higher. This faith in the press must be maintained at all costs because it is America's greatest safeguard. Likewise that faith places added responsibility on every newspaper man.

It may be hazardous to drop for one moment full attention to the difficult task that still confronts us—fighting the war. However, that war will not be won until the peace is won, and so it seems wise to plan for the future even while our soldiers are still locked in deadly combat with the enemy.

The new respect, reliance and confidence that has come to the nation's newspapers has thrust greatness upon them. It means they must continue as leaders in the future.

The tabloid was born out of the last war. The birth of any new idea is violent. The violence of that birth, which made such an attractive subject for movies, did the journalism profession great harm in public thinking. I hope we will avoid a similiar period after this war. Undoubtedly, however, the newspapers will undergo great changes in the war and post-war periods.

Our problem will be to fit newspapers into a communications field that will be greatly changed by developments in radio and television. These advancements will constitute progress of the sort to be admired and to be worked with instead of resisted. I do not look upon the developments in radio as a danger to newspapers. I think they will supply an urge to improvement in journalism. There will be a field for radio, and there will be a field for newspapers.

Sensationalism will not solve the problem for newspapers. The problem must be met with better and shorter writing, larger body type, better printing, and better staffs.

We will have to make type talk. Type must be used as an orator uses his voice—with expression, inflection and flexibility. There should be no hysteria, no attempt to flog up sensations with exaggerated black headlines. Yet headlines will be different from what they are today,

designed to sell the story to the readers. Every page of the paper will have to have color and charm. It will be animated and interesting. It will have the quality which you associate with a master of easy conversation.

But intelligent use of type will be merely the final step in the preparation of the newspaper of the morrow. The real work will start with excellent reporters who will find ways of making the story of good government, of labor, of finance, of science, interesting as well as accurate.

Of course, there will be stories of sex and love and tragedy. But newspapers will not depend wholly upon sensational stories for readers.

Newspapers are fortunate that the schools of journalism have prepared sufficient material for the staffs of the newspapers of the future. Many of these boys are now in the armed forces. I think those of us at home can assure those boys that we are determined to carry on well during their absence and that there will be interesting jobs awaiting them when they get home—jobs that will enable them to develop newspapers that will be well read and respected, jobs that will enable them to continue to serve America well.

After his boyhood on a western New York farm, Frank Gannett worked his way through high school and college, receiving an A.B. degree from Cornell in 1898. He plunged immediately into the newspaper business at Ithaca, and, in the course of the next thirty-five years he came to own or control through the Gannett Company of which he is president more than a score of newspapers, most of them in his native state. In the last decade he has taken a leading part in public affairs; he was strongly supported for the Republican nomination for President in 1940.

THE GROWING POWER OF THE PRESS

By FRANK E. GANNETT

The present war affords proof every day that a democracy cannot function without newspapers and that a democracy cannot carry on war successfully without the help of a free press. I am confident that when victory over our enemies shall have been won, a great measure of the credit will go to the newspapers. They have been a tremendous force in uniting the nation, in arousing our people, and in insisting on and aiding in an efficient prosecution of the war.

In no other country engaged in this great war, not excepting Great Britain, has there been greater freedom of the press than we have had in the United States. This, I am sure, has made us stronger in every way.

While I was in Germany, Italy, and Russia in 1935, when the Fascist dictators were preparing to conquer the world, I saw what it means to have a government-controlled press. I saw on editors' desks in Berlin and Rome, orders from the men in control of propaganda, telling what should be and should not be published, ordering this played up and that played down. Every item was carefully weighed as to its influence on the reader. Facts were suppressed, and fictitious stories created with that one objective in mind. The people in the Fascist countries never knew the truth; they were constantly misled and deceived. No one accustomed to our American newspapers has any idea to what extent freedom of the press was suppressed throughout Europe while the minds of the people over there were being conditioned for a war of aggression.

No one can appreciate fully what freedom of the press means until he has witnessed the conditions that I saw in Europe, long before the war actually broke out. Since hostilities began, we have not had access to the newspapers of the enemy governments; but, from the meager reports received through neutral countries, we can be sure they have sunk to new depths in misrepresenting the facts about the war.

As contrast to such conditions, we should look at our American newspapers. The most flagrant and preposterous lies from enemy sources can be published in our press without any restriction whatsoever. Most newspapers caution their readers that stories from Berlin, Rome, or Tokio are from enemy sources, but, nevertheless, they let the public know what the Axis powers are saying or claiming, and just how they are deceiving their peoples. For strategic reasons our Navy has seen fit to hold back facts about our losses on the sea, but, while a story may not always be complete, I feel sure that we have been giving the public the truth.

As a result, the American people can have full confidence in our press. This faith in our newspapers has increased their power, so that today it is greater than ever before. The public depends on its newspapers. The fact that today their circulation is at an all-time high proves conclusively that the public now relies on the newspaper more than ever before.

The men who make our newspapers are steadfast and absolutely unyielding in their belief that the public will not accept anything less than a free press. Any attempt by the government to influence or control the newspapers would destroy the great service which they render and would weaken our country beyond computation. The editors simply will not submit meekly. I hope our government will be wise enough never to attempt it.

An illustration of what the reaction would be if an attempt were made by the government to control our press is afforded by an incident that occurred in the Northwest recently. A subordinate in the Army released a piece of news with the condition that it should not be played with anything more than a single column heading. Wires carried the item with a note on the conditions imposed. Immediately there was a veritable explosion in all newspaper offices of the land. Protests poured into Washington, and, in almost no time, the foolish order was rescinded, and restrictions on the display of the item were entirely removed. The immediate, automatic indignation on the part of our editors shows that they are carefully guarding the freedom of our press every minute of the day, that they will not tolerate any invasions of that precious right.

Newspapers are produced by human beings and, since no one is perfect, a perfect newspaper cannot be expected. On the whole, however, our press stands as high as any other of our great institutions. Contrary to some assertions, its power has not been declining—it has been increasing. Its power has its roots in the fact that an informed people will govern itself. So long as we have faith in democracy and believe it to be the soundest, best mode of life, the way that offers most opportunity to the many, so long must we rely upon the newspaper for the basis of our self government.

Some of those who have been saying that the newspapers have lost their influence base their view on the fact that a President most of them opposed was elected and re-elected. It has been said that the Greeleys and Godkins of another day were powerful, that those old editorial giants could have elected or defeated the candidates they approved or disapproved. True, the newspapers did not prevent the lection of the President they opposed. Let it be said in their honor that they actually helped elect the candidate, because, while many of them questioned his qualifications, they were meticulous in seeing that the news columns offered him fair treatment. His arguments and those of his opponent were presented equally.

Readers do not always follow a newspaper for its editorial viewpoint. But they respect that viewpoint, knowing it to be based on honesty and knowledge, constant study, research, and experience.

Even when some misled publication is tempted to over-emphasize an item, or play it down, there remains assurance that the full truth will out. It cannot be claimed that every newspaper is right every time. Editors and publishers will make their mistakes and sometimes stoop to compromises. However, not every editor and not every publisher will falter at the same time, and thus, regardless of individual lapses, the Teapot Domes, the Veteran Administration evils, and other roguery are exposed to the eyes of all. Do not doubt for a moment that the rogues know the danger. The very existence of an unfettered press is a deterrent to such gentry. That fact in itself is a manifestation of the power of the press. William Allen White has expressed this idea in his own vigorous way:

"Whom do the great crooks fear, the public enemies either from the underworld or from the plug hat section of the upperworld? Listen to them snarl at the press! Whom do the crooked politicians on the right, or ignorant, amiable demagogues on the left denounce first of all? It's the press! If any group of bigots should attempt to undermine the liberties of the American people in the blind zeal of noble

fanaticism, what institution would they seek to throttle and discredit? It would be the American press."

Why this fear? It is because the malefactors know full well that however successful they may be in frightening one or more newspapers into silence, they cannot prevent ultimate exposure without choking all newspapers. This they never can do.

It is by no means desirable that all newspapers act in unison. The theory of a free press is not that the newspaper is always right. It is not even that it is always entirely honest. The theory, proven sound, is that, with a free press functioning, circulating information and discussion, the truth will emerge. It need not be an instantaneous demonstration.

Nor is it essential that a newspaper should forever be urging action of some sort. True, there are occasions when it feels called upon to demand the ousting of some rascals, or the erection of a town pump or the razing of infected slums. It should be remembered that the very existence of the press is a power in itself. It is there, like your electric current, even when it is not being employed.

One of America's news commentators is introduced to his public nightly with this catch line: "Only an informed America can be an invincible America." The greatest source of information for the average American is the newspaper. It cannot claim to have done its full duty by uttering one article on one pet subject. It must deliver as completely as possible the important news of an entire day. Only a newspaper reader can claim to be fully and immediately informed.

Newspapers are more conscious than ever before of their rôle as educators. Never have they gone to greater lengths to obtain the complete news, to garner it from the ends of the earth. Never have they been at greater pains to present news with its backgrounds. Never have they been more liberal in the use of visual aids. (It is a badly handicapped newspaper indeed, which does not illustrate its text with pictures which vividly illuminate.)

Hunger for news appears to be as natural as hunger for food. It transcends any desire for entertainment. This has been determined as a fact by a man whose business it is to reckon scientifically the likes and dislikes of readers. Dr. George Gallup has said: "I have made fifty to one hundred newspaper surveys and in no single instance did I find that features were more important than news. I don't know of a newspaper in this country that couldn't manage to get on if it dropped every single feature, but I know a lot that couldn't get on if they dropped the news." Since features include all the entertaining articles and drawings which embellish our papers, it must be clear

that we are dealing primarily with serious, thinking persons with a mental hunger not to be denied. Feeding such minds, the newspaper binds them to itself with bonds of affection and confidence.

Ask any citizen of New York how he suffered when a news dealers' strike kept the newspapers from him last fall. Ask him if he believes the newspaper has slipped from power.

Attacks on the press will undoubtedly continue. Practices which threaten our established democratic form of government cannot succeed so long as the people are informed and warned. Hence, those who wish to see the people deprived of rights long enjoyed, will be moved to follow the lead of dictators everywhere by first destroying or emasculating the press. Vigilance will prevent their success. It will not be vigilance of the press alone, fighting for its existence. It will be the vigilance of a people frightened at last at the prospect of being swallowed up in a way of life which puts the state first, the citizen last. Awareness of such dangers is the result of informed thinking.

There will be no Pearl Harbor for the press. It is on guard, and its readers are watchful too.

We have seen that power naturally accrues to an instrument of information devoted to the public good. Power of the press grows with opportunity for service. Our generation is living through one of the most troubled and most fruitful eras of all time. Never was there a more insistent call for service, for clear thinking, and for sane leadership. There never was a greater need for honest newspapers or a greater opportunity for them to serve their country. We have governmental problems posed by great upheavals in finance, industry and agriculture. Additional problems arise from our relations with the other peoples of the world. We face decisions which will bind posterity for years to come.

Fortunately the press is not fettered. It is the great agency in determining our future. Because the newspaper can and does bring information from the far corners of the earth, the little man as well as the big knows what is happening, what the result may be. Each will play a part in the final decisions because we still live in a democracy. Each will make his decision in thinking over the credits and debits of each proposal as presented in the news and discussed in the editorial columns.

The newspaper has lost power? No, it has never lost power so long as it was free to report the facts and to comment freely upon them. The press as a whole has never lost a battle, because all of the press has never been arrayed on one side of any issue. For the glory of this country may it never be thus unified!

A native Missourian, Mr. Ferguson has spent many years as editor and publisher of the *Fredericktown Democrat-News* in that state. He has been a leader in most of the town's civic affairs and he has been officially named its "otustanding citizen." He is president of the Missouri Press Association at the present time.

IDEALS AND DUTIES OF JOURNALISM

By O. J. FERGUSON

In this second year of war, we find that the newspapers have not lost their courage or poise, or their ability impartially to evaluate the factors in the crisis that engulfs us. They continue to take inventory of the facts, assort them, label them, explain them, and make them available in orderly fashion to the minds of a free people.

Be it said to the everlasting credit of American journalism that every suggestion of a controlled press has been opposed with almost religious fervor. Be it said to the credit of the American people that they had so well learned and so well appreciated the values of personal liberty that they have vigorously and unequivocally expressed opposition to any infringement upon a free press.

The press and the people have stood firmly on the premise laid down many years ago by Lord Burnham—that only the safety of the people can be urged as an excuse for denying the hospitality of the press to any fact or opinion. That part of President Washington's first inaugural address, emphasizing the importance of circulating information on all subjects, has taken on new significance:

"Knowledge is in every country the surest basis of public happiness. In one in which the measures of government receive their impressions so immediately from the sense of the community as in ours it is proportionately essential. To the security of a free Constitution it contributes in various ways—by convincing those who are intrusted with the public administration that every valuable end of government is best answered by the enlightened confidence of the people, and by

teaching the people themselves to know and value their own rights; to discern and provide against invasion of them; to distinguish between oppression and the exercise of lawful authority; between burthens proceeding from a disregard to their convenience and those resulting from the inevitable exigencies of society; to discriminate the spirit of liberty from that of licentiousness—cherishing the first, avoiding the last—and uniting a speedy but temperate vigilance against encroachments, with an inviolable respect to the laws."

As perhaps no other institution, American journalism at the beginning of the war realized its responsibilities and set about filling them. It realized that if the triumph of freedom is to be complete in the days of peace, it must not be crucified in the course of war. It realized that if democracy is to be an instrument of mankind in the future we must not neglect its fullest use in the present.

And so, such censorship as we have has been self-imposed and self-administered. We have put it upon ourselves, and we shall not hesitate to throw it off when the emergency shall have passed. We have no notion of making even a mild censorship a fixed policy in our way of life. Editors and publishers know that freedom of the press is a right which they claim not for themselves, but for all mankind. It is not primarily our profession that we seek to protect, but posterity—all the people in all the future. Someone has said that we must keep intelligence alive, we must keep information available, we must keep men's minds alert. Enlightenment and information belong, as a right, to all the people. News sources must be kept forever open and uncontrolled.

It is not enough in this war that we reserve to ourselves the right to carry on in the traditional manner of good journalists. More than that is required. Those who labor hard in the public service are certainly worthy of their hire, but the accumulation of large profits should not be uppermost in the mind of those who make our papers today. The problems and responsibilities confronting us today transcend any consideration of financial gain. Until our liberties are secure, we can afford to give but little thought to gain.

In the unsettled times of war, in the excitement and distraction of the hour, the guidance of a sane journalism is necessary as never before. People must be taught to keep their feet on the ground. Foolish notions, dangerous theories, constantly threaten. Poise, good sense, clear thinking are lessons to be taught. In the opportunity for the free interchange of opinion which our newspapers afford lies the chance for welding the American people into a harmonious whole.

It is the high privilege of the American press to take the lead in

promoting many of those activities without which success in the field of battle would be difficult if not impossible. It is our task to lead public opinion to attack the causes that underlie strikes and labor disputes. It is our task to stimulate farm and factory production, victory gardens, war finance, civilian defense, salvage collection. It is our task to promote public health, proper conservation of resources, and to combat the forces that lead to dangerous inflation. It is our task to interpret the problems and procedures involving the rationing of gasoline, tires, fuel, food, shoes, and man-power.

The doing of these things follows no set formula; in fact it is not desirable that it should. It will be a sad day when journalistic methods are regimented, when journalistic thought follows an established pattern.

The war may well bring some great blessings to journalism, particularly to community journalism. The scarcity of men and materials may force home the fact that bulk is no outstanding quality in any newspaper, and the necessity for smaller papers may force out the unwholesome details of crime, divorce and scandal. It may force us to cease offensive partisanship. It may convince us that it is no longer necessary to beg favors at the back door of any political party and that we are not community mendicants. It may make us more independent, more courageous, more self-reliant. We may be led to publish our papers with more attention to truth and good taste. We may be impelled to sift the good from the bad, the trivial from the vital. We may emulate the farmer who now grows twice the food on an acre than was possible a generation ago. The circumstance of necessity may teach us to give the public twice as much information and inspiration in half the number of pages.

After a year of bloody civil war, Lincoln informed Congress:

"The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves, and then we shall save our country. Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. We shall nobly save or meanly lose the last best hope of earth."

In the days ahead, American journalism will need new faith, new hope, and an enlarged charity. And it will need the rebirth of its inherent idealism.

Mr. Crown will this year celebrate his seventieth birthday and the forty-fifth anniversary of his beginning in journalism. A Virginian by birth and education, his newspaper experience in its first twenty years had a wide geographical spread. He worked, most often as city editor, on leading papers in Richmond, Washington, Chicago, Denver, New York, and New Orleans. He is now editor of the *New Orleans States*, having been with that paper for more than twenty-five years. In 1939 he received the Sigma Delta Chi award for courage in journalism for his work in connection with the exposure of the activities of the "heirs" of Huey Long.

THE FREEDOM OF THE FOURTH ESTATE

By JAMES E. CROWN

It might be well for the newspapers occasionally to call attention to Article I amending the Constitution, which the people found so necessary in order to realize their hopes and their desires. The Constitution had failed to guarantee these basic rights, and so, in order for the people to realize full freedom, the Congress and people adopted this immortal article as the first amendment to the Constitution: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the government for a redress of grievances."

Some may think that the freedom of the press is not now threatened. Maybe it isn't. But I believe it is the duty of the newspapers today to take no chances on so important a matter. I firmly believe that it is the duty of every newspaper to see that its rights are safeguarded in all legislation that may come before the Congress and in all actions of our political rulers. If the freedom of the press is curtailed in the least, then its part in helping to solve our post-war problems will be lessened.

It is self-evident that the freedoms are so correlated that where you weaken one you weaken all. It is the duty of every newspaper to keep these facts before the people. They should be told of the threats against their liberties and against their rights. It should be impressed upon them that the newspaper is their champion, their defender. The newspapers should be free to give all the news that the people should

have, all the news that does not prejudice the orderly procedure of government. They must be free to criticize the actions of our elected leaders and the actions of those occupying high places. The recent suit of the United States against the Associated Press is one of the indications that the government may seek to curtail the powers and duties of the press delegated to it in the Bill of Rights.

The defendant's answer to this suit says in part:

"The press is the only private enterprise expressly mentioned in our Constitution. Freedom of the press is not alone embodied in the constitutional guarantee thereof; it lies deeply embedded in the history of our country, in the way of life of our people, and in every concept of a republican form of government. Governmental right to regulate trade and commerce can under no pretense supersede or nullify the force of the special guarantee of freedom of the press and all that such guarantee connotes. The repeated attempts of Washington during the past ten years to construe the laws and special regulations issued by executive departments of the government, which have the effect of laws, in a fashion that places the press on a common level with commercial or business enterprises for the purpose of control and regulation, is an assault upon the validity of the Bill of Rights and the other historic charters and precedents which have emancipated man from political servitude."

Some may say that the fears that the freedom of the press will be curtailed are unfounded. I don't think so! I believe that not only the rights of the press, but the rights of the people have been lessened in recent years, and that if allowed to go unchecked, this threat will broaden until complete control over our liberties will be exercised by government.

History shows us, and it is useless to go into concrete examples because they are glaring, that wherever freedom of press has been curtailed, the rights of the people have been ignored and the rule of dictators has followed.

Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, President of Columbia University, expressed this thought when he declared:

"Nothing could possibly emphasize more strongly the vital importance of a free press than the absence of any free press today in a majority of the nations of this modern world. Tens of millions of intelligent human beings are purposely kept in darkness as to events which most gravely and intimately concern them, their posterity, and their happiness, at the behest of small groups of ruling tyrants and dictators. There are abuses of a free press, no doubt, but they are unimportant in comparison with the absence of a free press. The found-

ers of our national life were men who combined unexampled vision with practical sagacity. When they insisted upon a free press, they knew precisely what they were doing, and the American people will always bless them as outstanding benefactors."

Thomas Jefferson, the greatest exponent of a free press, once said:

"The basis of our government being the opinion of the people, the very first object should be to keep that right; and were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers or newspapers without a government, I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter. But I should mean that every man should receive those papers and be capable of reading them."

One of the great duties of a newspaper, now and after the war, will be to advocate that the people be given an opportunity of receiving a liberal education and thus make a free press accessible to them. A free people must be able to read a free newspaper, in order to protect its freedoms.

Kent Cooper, in a recent book, *Barriers Down*, broadly describes his fight to see that the people be given an opportunity to read unbiased news from all the world. He holds, in effect, that if an uncontrolled news service had been accessible and had been furnished to all the newspapers of all the nations of the world, there would have been no war. In this he is right. Give the people the truth, give them the news of what all the peoples of all the world are doing, and they can be depended upon to see that freedom and decency and honesty prevail. It was only when the press of France was controlled by Nazi collaborators and became a purveyor of Nazi propaganda that the principles of freedom and right were undermined in that country, resulting in its enslavement by Germany. The same procedure applies to the fall of other countries. And so we say that the great duty of the press of America today is to guard its freedom and to use it in winning the war and in solving the problems of the future, leading to a greater and a happier and a more prosperous world.

After this war is over, with victory for the right, the newspapers should prepare themselves for greater usefulness than any they have exercised in the past. Some months ago I read *Concerning the Fourth Estate*, a book by Dr. John E. Drewry, Dean of the School of Journalism of the University of Georgia and former president of the American Association of Teachers of Journalism. In that book I found the germ of an idea that has set me to thinking and wondering if I haven't found a principle that the newspapers of this country might do well to consider. I believe that journalism should be made a

major course in all of our schools and colleges and that students should be required to take this course in order to obtain certain degrees.

The high schools of the nation should also make journalism a part of their curriculum. I don't mean by this that every high school and college should enter the newspaper business. I do mean that every student should study those things that make for better citizenship and things that guide them in how best to make use of their newspapers. If every man, woman and child in America were able to read and understand the newspaper, freedom would live forever and right and decency in government would prevail.

The newspapers of today should be, and those of the future must be, edited and written by men and women thoroughly conversant with the economic, spiritual and other problems that will need discussion and solution after the war is over. Newspapers must see that their staffs are trained in subjects affecting world and national affairs, and give intelligent treatment of community enterprises and needs.

If a newspaper is what outstanding thinkers through the ages believe, then it is worth preserving—it is worth being kept free. It is worth all this because it can be a light unto the world. You can't shackle a newspaper and expect it to fight the battles of right and decency. And so I say it is the duty of the press to fight for all of its rights during this war and after this war is over. If it does, it will have the blessings of the people! If it doesn't, it will have the scorn of shackled millions!

I like to believe, and I hope that our profession does believe, that a newspaper is a living, breathing thing, a thing necessary to the happiness of the world, a thing with a heart and a soul, a thing to live for, a thing to fight for, a thing to die for if the time ever comes when this is necessary.

POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

Dr. Bush pursued graduate work at the University of Wisconsin, where he was for some years a member of the faculty of the School of Journalism. He has spent six years in active newspaper work. Since 1934 he has been head of the journalism division at Stanford University. He is the author of two widely used textbooks—*Newspaper Reporting of Public Affairs* and *Editorial Thinking and Writing*. At present he is president of the American Association of Schools and Departments of Journalism.

THE OPPORTUNITIES OF THE FUTURE

By CHILTON R. BUSH

These trying times have impelled those who are engaged in education for journalism to survey what they have been trying to accomplish during the past quarter century and also to reappraise their potential future contribution in a world of continued experiment in democracy. This has led, inferentially, to an appraisal of the press itself.

On the whole, the record of the press is good. There are some blemishes, of course—in the uncertain thirties as well as the idiotic twenties. But in the *international* field the press has a fine record.

The correspondents who have made journalism for Americans have been intelligent men and have been equipped with a high set of values. These men are respected today primarily because of the books they have written. The public frequently becomes acquainted with journalists when they reveal themselves between cloth covers and hardly at all when they are concealed by the procedures of daily journalism. But these men wrote the truth about Europe—in the newspapers. They were not compelled to write books in order to reveal the truth of Europe, as were the Continental correspondents of some prominent London papers. The Hitler pattern—war of conquest and revolution against civilization—was written on America's front pages. It was stated there clearly enough for all to comprehend.

There is every reason to believe that the American newspapers will promote a common-sense settlement of the international situation. When the war ends, conditions may be so chaotic that it will not be

possible to discern all of the correct solutions; but the current discussions of a world settlement by the press indicate an intelligent, tolerant, and realistic understanding of historical forces and national interests. Our newspapers—with a few exceptions that are explained in terms of psychopathology—have already beaten the demagogues to the draw. Whether or not the voice of the press will rise high enough above the demagogues' blatancy depends upon the extent to which our people are affected by the high rate of casualties, the degree of war and postwar inflation, and the prevalence of anarchy.

We are a fortunate people in that our system of education has supplied an increasingly larger audience of literates and thoughtful readers. It is much larger relatively, for example, than the British audience. It is possible to operate a newspaper on a considerably lower level of intelligence than is current, since so much advertising relates merely to the stomach and the skin. (For example, of the fifteen leading national newspaper advertisers in 1942, three sold food, three soap, four tobacco, and three toilet requisites.) But our publishers have generally chosen to improve their product as rapidly as the intelligence of their public would accept a better product; after the war we shall have another boom in education, and thus increase the size of the audience that will accept good newspapers.

No consideration of profit should be permitted to limit the extent of the postwar newspaper audience. I refer to those monopoly price considerations which have prevailed in the distribution of electrical energy (bringing about government subsidy of rural electrification) and which—with other compelling considerations—have caused the wartime lopping off of motor-route deliveries.

The farmer in the hinterland must have adequate information if he is to vote intelligently; otherwise, all sections of the community may suffer from unsound political decisions. Recent evidence of opinion polls suggests that it is the "uninformed" elements in the community who have the most untrustworthy opinions on those questions that determine the kind of world we shall live in. It has been demonstrated in some sections of the country that the farmer is willing to pay for the extra cost of delivery when the newspaper product itself is good. Too many farmers now are getting accustomed to doing without the newspaper; and it will be bad if, after the war, the assumption were made that a limited delivery by mail is as good as a larger delivery by carrier.

The war has demonstrated the indispensability of the newsppaper as a visual means of communication. Without the newspaper to pre-

sent the data of point rationing, the government would have been in a desperate situation. Without maps, readers could scarcely have followed most of the military and naval operations. Without the details of the printed word which permit confirmation of the immediate impression, the confusion in readers' minds as to whether we had sunk Japanese warships or they had sunk ours would have been terrific.

The present weakness of the newspaper is in the field of leadership and it is in that field that its contribution after the war can be improved.

The editorials in many papers are scarcely worth reading—because the literary form of the editorial is entirely inappropriate to the discussion of really important questions. It permits the writer to be oracular, but that is all. For editorials there should be substituted, in three cases out of four, articles of some length made typographically attractive and often illustrated. Such articles, assuming they are well done, would attract more readers, would supply more adequate interpretation, and would greatly increase the influence of the newspaper.

This does not mean that editorials should be written down to the lowest common denominator of intelligence. Such editorials would be of little value to thoughtful readers. An editorial directed to the thoughtful readers will convince more people, in the long run, than one aimed only at the masses of people. For the thoughts it contains will filter down by mouth-to-ear and will tend to be accepted because of the prestige of those thoughtful people who have been exposed to the editorial.

This proposal of editorial articles of broader scope is not an argument, however, for further imitation of magazine techniques in the news columns of the daily paper. The conditions of reading for daily newspaper readers and news magazine readers are not the same. With only a limited time, the daily newspaper reader seeks, first, a synopsis of the news. Although the individual pattern varies, in nearly all cases the daily newspaper reader selects what he will read and reads just what he has time for. In some instances he wants details, in others a mere outline. His mental set, in other words, resembles that of the school boy who has a limited time to prepare for an examination. His attitude is much less relaxed than is that of the magazine reader.

This means that the typographical presentation of news is still of great importance. The news must still be synopsized in headlines, the arrangement must be orderly, and the emphasis precise. The daily

newspaper is a utility that fulfills specific needs in specific circumstances and should be made to fit those needs and circumstances and not be designed in imitation of some other utility. I say this only because, in some quarters, there is a tendency to seek "a new formula" for daily journalism.

The magazine formula has importance for the Sunday newspaper and for some parts of the daily; but the present daily newspaper formula is based on sound appraisal of reader habits, and any great deviation from the present pattern is headed in an unrealistic direction.

The past decade has placed American newspapers on trial. They have been weighed in the balances of the public as never before. Certain weaknesses appeared and, for the most part, have been corrected. The verdict, on the whole, however, is that the American newspaper is highly respected. In the postwar period the newspaper should prosper and should become even a more useful instrument of democracy, provided the men who make the newspapers do not get cocky or lose their faculty of self-criticism.

Mr. Batten was born and educated in Philadelphia. He has been in the service of N. W. Ayer & Son since boyhood. He began in the firm's printing department, and, in the course of twenty-five years, he advanced to the presidency of that great advertising agency. He served in the United States Navy during World War I.

THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF ADVERTISING

By H. A. BATTEN

Of the many lessons which this war has taught, perhaps the most memorable is that of the enormous power—either for good or evil—which can be exerted by the spoken and written word.

In the minds of many people, propaganda is a peculiarly German weapon of warfare, just as the tank, the dive bomber, and the submarine are thought of as German weapons. Actually, the technique which, in modern war, has come to be known as propaganda was an American invention, as were the dive bomber and the submarine. The tank was a British invention. But in these as in many other instances, the Germans have surpassed us by their capacity for recognizing and developing the latent possibilities in other people's discoveries.

The word propaganda has acquired a sinister ring for the very reason that it is used almost exclusively in connection with war. But the art of propaganda as a military weapon differs in no essential aspect from the more peaceful arts of advertising, which have grown and flourished in this country for almost seventy-five years. The technique was developed here as an adjunct to private enterprise. It was adopted and expanded by the Germans as a weapon to serve the state. After this war will come the third step. Advertising will become a major tool of communication for the constructive exchange of ideas and information among all the peoples of the world.

It so happens that my profession is advertising, and it may be suggested that this prediction is the fruit of wishful thinking rather than evidence and logic. I do not believe that to be the case. There are

reasons why in future it will be of the utmost importance for the peoples of the world to communicate with one another freely; and there are also reasons why advertising can function more precisely and effectively than any other means of communication, toward that end.

To the man or woman who is accustomed to think of advertising as a form of selling—i.e., exclusively as a means of promoting the sales of a brand of coffee, or a dentifrice, or an automobile—this statement may come as something of a shock. Yet this concept of advertising (the traditional one) embraces only a fraction of its true scope. Advertising is a basic tool of management for mass communication. Its true function is not so much *selling* as *telling*. True, until recently, advertising has been used by business management principally to tell large numbers of people the virtues and conveniences of certain commercial products. It has been so used because experience has proved this to be the most effective and economical way of creating those mass markets without which there can be no mass production—or mass prices within reach of the common man. But today the true nature of advertising is beginning to emerge. Business management is using advertising to tell large numbers of people *not* to buy its products (as witness the recent gasoline shortages); *why* they cannot buy its products; what to do in the absence of those products; what it is doing to help win the war. This is not *selling*, but it is certainly *telling*. Moreover, there are forms of management other than business management. Government is management, and the government is using advertising with good effect in recruiting certain much-needed types of army personnel. Labor unions are management; and labor unions are beginning widely to advertise, to state their case in the court of public opinion. Indeed, any person or group that runs anything is management, from a men's Bible class to a world federation; and as such has ready to hand a powerful tool with which to place itself in touch with the people it seeks to serve.

Let us consider for a moment the kind of world which probably will exist after the war.

It will be, in the first place, an incredibly shrunken world. Spatially, of course, it will remain unchanged. There will still be 3,000 miles of ocean between Europe and the United States. Washington and Berlin will continue to be 4,500 miles apart. But reckoned in terms of time and accessibility, it will be a world in which everybody lives right next door to everybody else.

General Arnold has stated that the Boeing flying fortress is "the last of the small bombers." What the new, "big" bombers will be like

is still a military secret, but it is known that aerial monsters are on their way which can carry heavy bomb loads to Europe, drop them, and return to this country, if necessary, without stop. This means that isolationism, which almost always has its roots in a sense of personal security, can never again exist. In tomorrow's world, if war comes, absolutely no one will be safe from the possibility of aerial attack and sudden death. By the same token, it will be everybody's business to do everything possible to help preserve the peace. This, in turn, involves a common effort to avoid international misunderstandings and to arrive at a mutually sympathetic and coöperative point of view.

But over and above these elementary considerations of safety, there are almost limitless opportunities for constructive and reconstructive activity in the post-war world. The vast productive facilities which have been built up for the waging of mechanized war must be converted to the uses of peace. When this war is over there will be accumulated shortages amounting to famine in virtually every category of consumer goods. Two thousand million people will stand in critical need of new shoes, clothing, houses, sewing machines, radios, lamps, automobiles, refrigerators, needles, pins, scissors, cooking utensils, and hundreds of other things, to say nothing of adequate supplies of food and raw materials. In order to supply these needs, the whole complex fabric of international trade and finance must be repaired and rebuilt; for we have learned to our cost that no one country can find within its own territories, or process profitably, all the raw materials which enter into our elaborate and mechanized way of life today. And finally, some practical plan must be worked out and universally subscribed to which will provide a framework for the amicable adjustment of economic problems and nationalistic differences and points of view.

The most pressing problems of the post-war era will be, then, to set up safeguards against future wars, to set up anew the machinery of international trade, and to set up a world plan for peaceful economic competition and coöperation.

These problems are formidable; but one thing at least we know concerning them—they cannot be settled by fiat. If the solutions arrived at are to enjoy any measure of enduring success, they must first command the understanding and approval of the man in the street. That day is past when the fate of the world can be settled arbitrarily by a little group of politicians or diplomats sitting in star-chamber session. Woodrow Wilson discovered that, when he attempted to commit the United States to membership in the League of Nations without consulting the Senate. It has been the verdict of history that Woodrow

Wilson was, on that occasion and in terms of his planned objective, a quarter-century ahead of his times. But the point is, he failed because he did not have behind him the force of public opinion. He perceived, as few then perceived, the urgent need of international unity and cooperation. What he did not perceive was the even greater necessity of conducting the world's affairs by the will and consent of the people.

The inescapable conclusion which emerges from all this is the paramount importance of placing in the hands of the people all the pertinent considerations and all the facts.

At this point we find ourselves confronted with the question: just how are you going to place in the possession of millions of people scattered all over the face of the globe sufficient information to enable them to formulate a passably sound and intelligent opinion concerning their own affairs?

That, surely, is the greatest problem in mass communication which has ever been posed. And not the least part of it resides in those two words "sound and intelligent."

It would be a tremendous job to communicate directly with two thousand million people, or even with the millions comprising a nation or economic group. It would be far more difficult to communicate with them in such a way that the pros and cons of a given matter would be equitably presented. Yet I contend that such an undertaking is possible, and not only possible but absolutely imperative if this rapidly shrinking world is to escape social and economic chaos.

We can better understand the potential rewards of such a project if we examine the methods now commonly used in the field of international relations. Reduced to its simplest terms, the peoples of this earth have always permitted their differences to be settled, short of war, by a small group of more or less self-appointed poker players who gambled with other people's chips, and admitted no kibitzers to the game. To the man in the street, such things as treaties, alliances, ententes, ultimata and spheres of influence are so much Greek—not because he is incapable of understanding the situations and issues involved, but because he is denied all opportunity really to understand them. Without knowledge there can be no understanding.

In the past several decades, particularly since the coming of radio, there has been, to be sure, a phenomenal use of nationalistic propaganda. But such propaganda, as it exists today, can scarcely be called a dependable source of information. Propaganda, in the hands of an unscrupulous and unprincipled state such as the Third Reich, is rather a source of carefully contrived misinformation.

Actually what is needed is a truthful and factual presentation of

both sides of any given argument, and *one that can be brought to the attention of all the people of all the nations involved.* This is the equivalent of saying that all future disputes between nations or parts or groups of nations must be settled in the court of public opinion. Only in this way can we ever achieve our dream of "open covenants openly arrived at."

This court will never convene formally in any one place, but its power and influence will be sovereign, nonetheless. That power will be delegated. In due time the representatives of the nations will meet and arrive at a decision. But in so doing they will follow, not their own intuitions and opinions, but those of the people. And insofar as it is humanly possible, these opinions will be informed opinions, based upon a widespread hearing and discussion of both sides of the case.

The mechanics of any such procedure would necessarily exist, as I have said, on a tremendous scale. Nothing approaching the scope of this essay in public communications has ever been attempted, even in the United States. For it would consist in the responsible use of all known media—newspapers, radio, magazines, billboards, moving pictures, television—for the purpose of conveying a message and stating a case, not to the people of one nation, but at one time or another to the people of all the world.

More specifically, this means that if the United States, for example, were to find itself at cross purposes with France on some important issue which might lead to serious complications, the government of the United States would seek to inform both the American public and the French public of our point of view and the facts and circumstances behind it; while the French government simultaneously would explain the French position to the people of France and of the United States.

In order to insure the successful operation of this plan it would be necessary to include, in any post-war agreement for coöperation among the nations, a provision requiring each nation to grant free entrance and admittance to the informative messages of any other nation. In other words, the cardinal sin in post-war society would be that of coloring or suppressing information from any source.

Such a free interchange of information and ideas among the peoples of the world would be a great step forward in the struggle for human liberty. But every increase in freedom involves a corresponding increase in responsibility. It would devolve upon every nation to see to it that its case was fairly and factually stated, both for foreign and home consumption. And this matter should be subject to the vigilant supervision of a special Committee of Information in whatever species of world federation may exist. It would be the duty of

this committee to challenge and if necessary to hold up for investigation any statements which seemed to be notably lacking in truth, logic, or reason.

I have attempted, in the foregoing, to suggest the urgent need, in the post-war world, of a system of free exchange of information and ideas not only between governments but between *peoples*. In so doing, I have used the concepts and vocabulary of advertising. I have done so because there is no other method by means of which this plan can be made to work.

The reason will be clear if we consider the nature of the undertaking. What we want to do is to place before a tribunal—i.e., all the people of at least two countries—all the evidence in a highly controversial case. This evidence is not news. It is not primarily educational or entertaining. It is special pleading, devised by an interested party to gain an end. It differs in no material way from the testimony produced and placed upon the record in a court of law. The only difference is that in one case you have a jury of twelve people and in the other you have to reach a jury of many millions.

Now, it is not the function of a newspaper or magazine to fill its editorial columns with special pleading. The editorial columns of a newspaper are meant for news, and the editorial columns of a magazine are designed for matter which is basically either entertaining or educational in nature. Both media operate under a tacit agreement with their readers not to expose them (the readers) to special pleading masquerading as something else. The best and most influential newspapers and magazines adhere strictly to this agreement.

But almost all newspapers and magazines maintain columns other than editorial columns, in which special pleading is both proper and welcome. These columns are the advertising columns, and, with the important exception of radio broadcasting, they offer the only practicable means by which a controversial issue can be brought fully and clearly before large masses of people.

For reasons, then, both of professional ethics and self-interest, it can be assumed that the newspapers and magazines of the world will consistently exclude from their editorial columns all controversial material of the type which for our purposes it would be necessary to communicate.

It may be suggested, in all sincerity, that such controversial matter —when made the subject of a speech or statement by a person of sufficient importance—thereby automatically becomes news, and as such should be reported freely in the news columns. This view is widely held in Washington. I do not agree with it, but I shall not argue the

point. It is sufficient to show that this method of doing the job would break down from natural causes.

It is our aim, let us remember, to lay the case squarely before the people of both countries. In the hypothetical case of a dispute between France and the United States, it might be possible to get a certain amount of news coverage in this country for the American case, but what of France? What is news in America is not necessarily news abroad. What power on earth, other than the power of the profit motive, would induce the owner of a French newspaper to devote a large portion of his total space to the detailed reporting of a statement by some government official in America—especially if the statement ran counter to current French sentiment?

And there is another consideration. Even if the statement were reported, it would be subject to a certain amount of necessary journalistic processing, in both countries. It might be cut or rewritten or summarized. It would be provided with a headline and subheadings. In this process it is conceivable—as any newspaper man will admit—that unintentional changes may be made in its general mood and meaning. Newspaper men as a group are hard-working, honorable and conscientious; but they work under exacting limitations of time and space.

The net of it is that no matter how carefully or skillfully you prepare a statement for the press, you have no control over the form in which it will finally appear. As a matter of fact, you have no assurance that it will appear at all.

With advertising, the exact reverse is true. The space to be devoted to an advertisement is agreed upon in advance by its sponsor and the management of the publication, and once determined, no outside influence or circumstance can affect it. Similarly, the message which occupies that space is guaranteed to appear *precisely as prepared by the sponsor*. Nobody has the right or authority to change so much as a comma of it. So long as it remains within the bounds of ordinary respectability and good taste, nothing can ever modify it or interfere with its publication.

The difference between advertising and all other forms of mass communication (other than government-owned radio) is the difference between asking a small boy to deliver a note to the grocer as a favor, and asking a small boy to deliver a note to the grocer for a quarter. In one case, the note may or may not arrive. In the other, it is pretty certain to get there. In this world, you seldom get something for nothing.

The full extent of the independence of thought and expression en-

joyed by an advertisement is measured by the fact that the sponsor of the advertisement ordinarily formulates his message, has it set in type, and sends it to the publication in the form of a solid metal plate. The editors and their assistants never see this plate; it goes direct to the mechanical department. As a matter of fact, ninety-nine times out of a hundred the editorial staff does not even know in advance what is going to appear in the advertising columns. The transmission of the message is *controlled* throughout by the person or group most immediately affected.

This control is a basic feature and advantage of advertising as a mass-communications technique.

As to radio, in England and on the Continent most of the broadcasting stations are government-owned, and do not accept programs from outside sources. Inasmuch as we propose in all cases to insure the safe arrival of our messages by paying for them, some special arrangement would have to be made for the use of broadcasting stations outside of the United States. Within the United States, the regular broadcasting channels would be used, both for the statement of our own case and that of our friendly opponents, at the usual time rates.

Would the phenomenon of government as a large-scale advertiser destroy the traditional freedom of the press? Would newspapers and magazines abandon their duty to criticize and comment, in order to curry favor with government officials and thus improve their chances of receiving governmental advertising contracts? I do not think so. It would be necessary only to remove these matters from official hands and place them in the care of professional advertising counsel. In this way the allocation of advertising appropriations could be accomplished with the same objectivity and impartiality as that which governs the spending of any large commercial advertising appropriation today.

To sum up, by using and expanding the controlled power of advertising on a world-wide scale, the peoples of this earth can communicate directly and clearly with one another; and any differences among them can be settled amicably on the basis of a fair hearing of the arguments and proposals on either side.

A fair hearing is the crux of our difficulties as nations. Given half a chance, the common man generally proves himself to be a reasoning and reasonable creature, far more penetrating in his judgments than the professional seers and men on horseback who presume to do his thinking for him. History provides relatively few instances, however, of occasions when this chance has been forthcoming. The common man is born, lives, and dies in profound ignorance of what is

really going on, simply because in any given issue he hears only one side of the case. Deprived of facts, he substitutes emotion. This is not, as a rule, the result of a calculated plot. It is simply because it has been nobody's business to bring the other side of the matter to his attention.

I contend that it will be impossible to generate enough prejudice, passion, and hatred to start a war if the common man is given the opportunity to learn something about the other fellow's point of view and the other fellow's character and problems. So far, the stupendous power of "telling" has been used by the wrong people in international affairs, and in the wrong way. It has been employed to foster racial hatreds and nationalistic superiority complexes, to intimidate neighbors, to spread false information and sow the seeds of violence and discontent. We must reverse this process. In place of lies we must spread truth. Instead of the emotions, we must appeal to reason. Where before there were outpourings of pride and fury, we must substitute friendship and candor and good will. The cost will be great, but it will not be one one-thousandth of the cost of war. And in any case, if this world is worth saving at all, the task is worth doing. "Give the people light, and they will find their way."

Born and educated in Indiana, Mr. Cooper began his newspaper career in that state. He began writing for the papers when he was a boy of thirteen. In 1910 he joined the Associated Press and ten years later, he became assistant general manager of that news agency. In 1925 he became general manager, a responsibility he now holds with the title of Executive Director. Among his outstanding achievements are Wirephoto and extension of the AP system abroad. His notable book, *Barriers Down*, was published in 1942.

NEWSPAPER STATESMANSHIP FOR PEACE

By KENT COOPER

In war, the battle with shot and shell and the rout of the enemy carry the men who are in it to the glowing satisfaction of great accomplishment. Victory in battle affords the thrill that nothing else can bring to the soldier, for winning the war against an unscrupulous aggressor is indeed a sublime achievement.

But winning the peace will be an even greater accomplishment. Each man with a gun and each man loyally and honestly supporting the man with a gun will have done what he can to bring about that end. Then the terms of settlement will reflect whether victory has brought the supreme accomplishment, namely, a durable peace.

As this is written, a discussion of peace terms which could be imposed by a victorious America is quite premature. It is dangerous to prophesy; yet the peace, to me, seems a very long way off. Nevertheless, it is the very nature of the heart of a nation that did not want war to yearn for peace. Thus the people of such a nation even from the day it declares war begin to contemplate the terms of peace. The longer the war, the more agitated become the discussions of what the peace shall provide.

It is human for the victor to want satisfaction and compensation. And it is axiomatic that the imposition of harsh terms sows the seed for later wars. In healing the wounds of war, victors have applied themselves to healing the effects of war, not the causes. This time we are once more hearing discussions of how the causes of war shall be exterminated.

I suppose I can be forgiven if I have an exaggerated idea of what the American press can do to eradicate the causes of war. Although the newspapers have invariably editorialized on the causes of wars and the proposals for peace, newsmen have not been treaty makers. Nor have they made demands. It has seemed to me that at the peace conferences all business interests have had their representatives making demands—except the press, whose representatives are there only as reporters. It is a fact that never at the end of any war in history has a united effort of the newspaper men of any nation demanded that a peace treaty contain a clause affecting any element of the news business. An experiment in that direction in connection with the next peace treaty would, therefore, be as interesting as it would be novel.

Now, it is too much to expect that newsmen will sit at the peace tables. Around those tables will be, as always, politicians and soldiers in the rôles of statesmen. This in spite of the fact that it is doubtful whether any politician or soldier can have any better understanding of most of the causes of war than accomplished newspapermen of international experience. Certainly only newsmen have competent knowledge of the one cause of war concerning which I mean to be specific.

Like most Americans, newspapermen here have usually been absorbed in the domestic scene. Nevertheless, twice within the lifetime of most of them they have had their status changed by world wars. The first time, they were catapulted into an era of newspaper prosperity. The second time they are seeing their activities and their prosperity curtailed. Not one of them knows what tomorrow may bring. All of them are fearful. They wonder whether, even if prosperity returns to them, their newspapers will suffer restraints of their activities and their expressions.

If any other business were confronted with such a situation it would do something about it, and the press would give advice on what that business should do. Affected itself, and groping blindly for security, the American press could well afford to draw favorable attention upon itself through a crusade for world acceptance of the status upon which it has been built. World-wide advocacy of the principle of a free press and what it takes to make a free press successful would strengthen the standing of a free press in the United States. The people do not understand that a free press is their heritage. Thus in perilous times for all, the American newspaper institution might bring understanding to the people and at the same time lift itself out of its despair by endeavoring to attain the extension of the democratic principle of a free press.

I maintain that it would be altogether appropriate for some news-

paper statesmanship to be exerted in the next peace conference. A free press is but one of the things it should demand. It should take as its premise the fact that suppression and control of the press by governments constitute a prime cause of wars. This is easy of proof. Militant action looking toward what we have and mean to keep here could gain not only renewed security for the status of the press at home, but new respect abroad. Even if it could not gain any perceptible change in freedom of the press abroad, it could at least be assertive in a matter that profoundly affects the press internationally as well as domestically.

That matter is the endeavor to gain guarantees that, first, news at its source shall be freely available to all everywhere; and, second, that no country shall give preferential transmission facilities to its own press as against the press of any other country. This means that correspondents of individual newspapers and press associations everywhere should have direct and equal access to the news of all governments and equal facilities of transmission thereof to their own countries.

In stating briefly how this would eradicate a cause of war, I do so only to emphasize what may be within the knowledge of all news men. Exclusive access to the news of governments can only be gained by a news service through its subordination to the government that affords such exclusive access. That means that the government's news story can be told in only one way, the government's way, with the resulting perversion of the truth when necessary to serve that government's purpose. Availability of news at the source, with the resulting competition in getting it and preparing it for publication understandably, will lead to the disclosure of the truth to all peoples. And it is the truth that makes men free. Governments never have an easy time inciting free men to war. Thus if the truth is available, men everywhere will be free and there will be less likelihood of war.

The American press should awaken to this opportunity; it must attain unity of purpose and it must establish leadership.

This, then, is an expression of hope that whenever the day of peace shall come, the American press will seek its place in the sun. As truly as it has through lack of interest contributed to a cause of war, it can rise to this opportunity. It must drop its passive rôle. Its interest must be intensely active. The strongest newspaper force ever developed in any nation must give to all the world the principles of its idealism.